

THE EVANGELICAL REVIEW.

NO. XXXII.

APRIL, 1857.

ARTICLE I.

DR. SCHMUCKER'S LUTHERAN SYMBOLS.

American Lutheranism vindicated; or, examination of the Lutheran Symbols, on certain disputed topics: including a reply to the "Plea" of Rev. W. J. Mann. By S. S. Schmucker, D. D., Professor of Christian Theology in the Theological Seminary of the General Synod at Gettysburg, Pa. Baltimore: T. Newton Kurtz, 151 West Pratt Street. —1856.

THE attempt to introduce a new confession of faith into the Lutheran church of the United States, has already been noticed in this journal, in various ways. The author of the work to which we are now about to direct attention, has displayed great literary, as well as personal activity in this effort. From the appearance of his "Popular Theology" [in 1830], to the book now before us, all his publications bearing upon the Lutheran church, have had this tendency; either directly or indirectly. The whole of this, however, culminated and took its most distinct and proper form in the "*Definite Platform*," which, although endorsed by others, was properly his work, both in design and execution. The opposition with which the "*Platform*" met, not only from our theologians, but from the great mass of the church, being everywhere promptly rejected and condemned, except by a few Western Synods, and a few of our Eastern ministers, trained under peculiar influences; this almost unanimous opposition to the "*Platform*," we say, necessitated not only reiterated apologies and defences of the Platform, by its authors and advocates,

but even a very considerable modification of the Platform itself. The Platform, as originally prepared, not only contemplated, but almost in so many words, proposed a division of the Lutheran church. Professing to be written in the spirit and in the interest of the General Synod of the Lutheran church, and to be only a legitimate and consistent application of its principles, "constructed in accordance with the principles of the General Synod," says the title, ("perfectly consistent with the doctrinal test of the General Synod"—Preface to Def. Plat. p. 2,) or rather, the proper explanation and application of them (Platform p. 4), it was here proposed (by resolution III) to ostracise all who would not unconditionally receive the Platform, and its interpretations and misrepresentations of the Augsburg Confession and other symbols of the church; in a word, to divide the General Synod, by refusing fellowship to a certain part of its members. So prompt and decided was the rejection of this feature of the Platform, by the great mass of the church, lay as well as clerical, wherever it was understood, that the leaders in this movement found it necessary to disavow the project, and it was declared that this was not the design, or the proper sense of the article, and that it was only intended that ministers should receive all the doctrines set forth in the altered confession, but that their adherence to the unaltered Augsburg Confession, should be no bar to synodical fellowship! And yet one of the prominent reasons urged for adopting the Platform was, that the Lutheran church was rendered odious by being represented as holding certain doctrines of the Augsburg Confession, and other symbolical books, and that they wished to have no connection with so called "Old Lutherans."*

To meet this, a revised edition of the Platform was soon published, with some verbal alterations and notes, which only rendered its inconsistencies the more glaring. Thus, for example, whilst it is said in the last paragraph of the "Preface" that "Part II of this Definite Synodical Platform, is not a part of the pledge, or doctrinal basis, to be individually subscribed," &c., the preceding paragraph tells us that, "any District Synod connected with the General Synod, may, with perfect consistency, adopt this Platform, *if the majority of her members approve of the Synodical disclaimer contained in part II,*" showing very clearly that the second part is essential to the whole plan. The clause which we have itali-

* See Essays of Dr. Sprecher, and others, in the late "Ev. Lutheran."

cised, is also added to the revised edition, as the absurdity of expecting a District Synod which received the Augsburg Confession entire, to adopt the Platform, was palpable.

But as all this was not sufficient, in the work before us we have not only another defense of the Platform, but a third edition, and a new metamorphosis of the "Definite Platform," which thus, after all, appears to be very indefinite, and to need more alterations than the old Augsburg Confession and the other "*former Symbolical Books*," so much decried by this Chameleon-like document. Here, in an Appendix, we have a "Definite Platform, being the doctrinal basis or creed — constructed in accordance with the principles of the General Synod." To say nothing of the new Preface, which is, however, a very different thing from both its predecessors, we only observe that all traces of the ostracising and excising process, so zealously and definitely urged in the two editions preceding, are here carefully removed—part second is omitted bodily—and the whole is razed down to a simple avowal of belief in certain articles, altered and unaltered, of the Augsburg Confession, together with the presentation of some motives for this alteration of the long established faith of the church.

We cheerfully admit that this is some improvement, so far as regards, not only the style and language of the article, though these are not yet rendered, by any means, faultless, but still more the matter, of which the less we have the better. And, in view of these facts, we should think that few will regard the omens of permanence in this new confession, as by any means promising.

But our main object at this time is, briefly to examine the new reasons here urged in defense of this somewhat fluctuating Platform, which seems to have been called "*definite*," upon the principle of the Roman etymologist, who says that "*lucens*" is derived "*a non lucendo*."

We should be utterly inexcusable, if we were here to indulge in any personalities. The author is so complimentary to his principal opponent, so greatly deprecates the failure of "*both parties*" heretofore conducting "this discussion, to exhibit christian comity, and abstain from personalities," that we should be very dull scholars indeed, if we did not profit by his example, as well as by his warnings. Men are indeed responsible for their personal acts, to all who are affected by them, and those occupying public stations, are always liable to be called to an account by their constituents, and those

whom their actions affect. But we have nothing of this kind now in view, and speak simply of the book before us, and of other literary productions and public documents connected therewith, involving great principles, affecting the faith and order of the church, as well as our relations to the same in the past, the present and the future.

Our author admits the importance, and even the necessity of a creed, calls the Augsburg Confession "venerable," but reiterates the assertion of the Platform, that it contains many very serious errors, and calls upon the Lutheran church to correct these errors, and reform its creed. These are very serious charges, and involve most momentous consequences, and before we act upon them, we owe it to ourselves, to the good name of our church, and to her usefulness and position in the world, to ascertain how far they are well grounded, whether our creed does really contain the errors alleged, or is open to the objections urged. We must, therefore, carefully examine our author's statements, both in order to ascertain how far he is a reliable witness, and to understand the nature of the errors thus charged upon this fundamental Confession, not only of Lutheranism, but of Protestantism itself. We cannot, of course, follow him into all his details, but we can give various specimens, which will both show the nature of his argument, and satisfy every impartial mind how little dependence is to be placed upon any of his reasonings. We shall show that he fails in a correct statement of simple matters of fact, which would be sufficient to invalidate reasonings far more lucid and logical than any which are presented by him.

We might join issue with him, in regard to his preliminary matter, especially the statement upon page nine, where it is said that, "This principle" (of doctrinal indifference) "permeates the Constitution of the General Synod and of her Seminary." The Constitution of that Seminary is very specific in its acknowledgement of the authority of the Augsburg Confession, and of *both* the Catechisms of Luther. (See Res. I, of Statutes of the General Synod, and Art. III, Sect. 2, of the "Constitution of the Seminary," where the Professor is required to declare his belief, that the Augsburg Confession and Catechisms of Luther are a summary and just exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the word of God.") But we pass on to topics more immediately connected with the Augsburg Confession itself.

Our author begins his attack upon the Augsburg Confession by stating (p. 22) that, although Luther "approved the

Augsburg Confession, as drawn up by Melanchthon, he told him that he had yielded too much to the Papists." This charge he endeavors to establish, in his *third chapter*, where he undertakes to show the great "disadvantages under which the Augsburg Confession was prepared," in setting forth which, he labors with a zeal worthy of a Maimbourg or a Bossuet. Our most learned and most acute historians, such men as Mosheim and Merle d'Aubigne, have seen the hand of God in the Reformation, not only in its great movements, and in the gradual preparation of the world for that grand event, but even in its minute details, and especially in the selection of such instruments as Luther and Melanchthon, and in their mutual adaptation to each other. But our author can see nothing of all this—he can only deplore the weakness, not to say the wickedness and treachery of Melanchthon! We used to regard it as a special interposition of divine providence, that Luther's harshness was tempered by Melanchthon's mildness; yea, even Luther himself, seems to have felt something of this kind;* but now we are told that it was thus that the Reformation was arrested and betrayed!

The evidence mainly relied upon to establish the fact that Melanchthon had made improper concessions to the Romanists, and that Luther was, on that account, greatly dissatisfied, both with him and with the Augsburg Confession, is contained in a letter of Luther's, written from Coburg on the 29th of June, 1530, and so, four days after the delivery of the Confession. No one will doubt that, in order to convey a correct impression of this letter, the first, and most important step is, *to quote it correctly*. This, we are sorry to say, our author has entirely failed to do. How far this is his fault, and how far he has been misled by his authorities, we are unable to determine. But certainly, when he was making so serious a charge, not only against Melanchthon, but against the whole Lutheran church, which has adopted this Confession, and for centuries regarded it as one of the most powerful bulwarks that was ever erected against Romanism, it might reasonably

* So we understand his letter of the 15th of May, where, in reply to the inquiry of the Elector of Saxony, as to his opinion of the first draft of the Confession, as prepared by Melanchthon, he says: "Most illustrious prince! I have carefully read (über lesen) M. Philip's Apology: it pleases me exceedingly, and I do not know that I could improve it in any way, or change it—nor would it beseech me: for I cannot move so mildly and quietly. May Christ our Lord aid, that it may bring forth much fruit, as we hope and pray—Amen."

be required of him that he should examine the original of this letter, and not rely, in a matter of such vital importance, upon *garbled extracts from a translation*. Instead of examining the *original* of this letter, which is so accessible in De Wette's collection of Luther's letters (Vol. 4, No. 1236, pp. 51—54), he seems to have relied upon a second hand citation of a *translation* which professes to be taken from the Leipsic edition of Luther's Works, B. XX, p. 185. But in this professed quotation there are two most serious defects; first, the connection is destroyed by the *omission of a whole sentence* which is material to the full understanding of the passage; and secondly, only a part of the last sentence is given. Accordingly, Dr. Schmucker's citation reads thus: "Your Apology I have received, and wonder what you mean when you desire to know what and how much may be yielded to the papists. As far as I am concerned, too much has already been yielded to them in the Apology." But the original runs thus: "I have received your Apology, and wonder what you mean, when you ask, what and how much may be yielded to the papists? *As regards the Elector*, it is a different question as to what he may yield, if danger impends over him. *But as for me*, more than enough has been conceded in that Apology, *which if they refuse*, I see nothing more that I can yield, unless I shall have seen their arguments and citations of scripture clearer than I have hitherto seen them. I spend day and night in reflecting upon this subject, and examining it in every direction, carefully searching all the scriptures, and my assurance in our doctrine constantly increases, and I am more and more confirmed in it, so that (by the will of God) I will now permit nothing more to be taken from me, let the result be what it may."* Now who does not see that Luther here intends merely to say that, *as far as he is personally concerned*, the Confession (which is here called an "Apology") has made all the concessions that are to be thought of, more, perhaps, than he would have been willing to make, if

* "Accessi Apologiam vestram, et miror quid velis, ubi petis, quid et quantum sit cedendum pontificibus. De Principe est alia questio, quid illi concedendum sit, si huic periculum impendat. Pro mea persona plus satis cessum est in ista Apologia, quam si recusent, nihil video quid amplius cedere possim, nisi videro eorum rationes et scripturas clariores, quam hactenus vidi. Ego dies et noctes in ista causa versor, cogitans, volvens, disputans, et totam Scripturam lustrans, et augecit mihi assidue ipsa ἀπολογία in ista doctrina nostra, et confirmor magis ac magis, Dass ich mir, es Gott will, nu nichts mehr werd nehmen lassen, es gehe lieber wie ihm welle."—De Wette L. B. 4, p. 52.

he had stood alone. But he knew himself, and the impetuosity of his own feelings, and was therefore glad to have this document drawn up by his cautious friend, as we have seen above. Moreover, he did not wish to be a dictator in this matter, or in anything else that concerned this mighty work of the Reformation. This is a charge that has often been made by Romanists, and other enemies of the gospel. But this very letter affords an ample refutation of this aspersion. In a passage which almost immediately follows the one just cited, he says: "I dislike it in your letter, when you write that you" (the Evangelical party in whose name Melancthon drew up the Confession) "have followed *my* authority in this matter: I am unwilling to be called your leader (*Autor*), although that might be satisfactorily explained; but I object to this term. *If it is not, at the same time, and equally your cause, I am unwilling that it should be called mine, and be spoken of as if imposed upon you.* I will manage it myself, if it belongs to me alone." Hence it is manifest that Luther had no intention of making the Augsburg Confession conform at all points to his own personal feelings and views, and he would not, therefore, object to it that it made concessions which he, in the heat of controversy, would have been unwilling to make. He wished it to be the confession of the church, of the whole body of protestants, and not of himself merely as an individual. This is still clearer from a *Post-script* which he adds to this same letter, and which is absolutely necessary to the understanding of the passage cited by our author, who, however, seems unconscious of the existence of such an elucidation of the point at which he was laboring. We give it entire: "After my letter was closed, the thought occurred, that you might perhaps think that I had not replied to your question, how much and how far we should yield to our opponents: but you also have not inquired or indicated what demands are likely to be made upon us. *I, as I have always written, am prepared to yield everything to them, if only they will but leave the gospel free to us.* But that which is opposed to the gospel, I cannot yield. What else can I answer?"*

Here we find Luther checking and correcting himself, as if fearful that he had been too hasty in seeming to charge Melancthon with a disposition to make improper concessions. And, in fact, Melancthon had merely inquired what they

* Ubi supra p. 54.

could do in this direction; that is to say, whether it was possible for them to make any kind of a compromise with the church of Rome. He did not say that he believed that they ought to do so, or that anything of the kind was possible, but simply asked Luther's opinion in the premises, so that he might be prepared for any movement which the opposite party might make.

But it is said that "the various charges made by Melancthon, between the 15th of May and 25th of June," had led Luther to express his dissatisfaction with the Augsburg Confession, as finally adopted by the protestant party, and presented to the Diet. On the contrary, we know that Luther most cordially approved of that confession, and rejoiced in it as one of the most glorious triumphs which the gospel had ever achieved. Thus we find him, on the 3d of July, four days after the date of the letter so confidently cited as condemnatory of the confession, thus distinctly expressing himself to Melancthon: "*I have to-day read over the whole of your Apology, and it pleases me greatly.*"* And on the 5th he writes with evident satisfaction to Nicholas Hausmann, in regard to the delivery of the Augsburg Confession, among other things, "One bishop is reported to have said, 'this is the pure truth, we cannot deny it.' And on the next day he writes to Cordatus, 'I have a copy of that confession and rejoice exceedingly to have lived to this hour, in which Christ was publicly preached by these, his own most illustrious confessors, in so great a public assembly, and in a confession undoubtedly most glorious (*plane pulcherrima*).'" Luther was too candid, ever to bestow such an eulogy upon a document with which he was dissatisfied, or which he was disposed to denounce as "yielding too much to the Romanists." But he goes on to add to this strong language: "Thus is it fulfilled, '*I will speak of thy testimonies before kings,*' and that also shall be fulfilled, '*I was not confounded.*' Because, '*Whoso confesseth me before men,*' saith He who cannot lie, 'him will I also confess before my Father who is in heaven.'"

On the following day (July 6) he writes to the Elector Albert, the archbishop of Mainz: "Your Grace has, doubtless, as well as others, read and understood the Confession presented by our friends, and I am bold to say that they have expressed themselves in such a way, that they can joyfully say with Christ their king . . . It does not shun the light, but

* Briefe IV. p. 68.

can sing with Psalm 119: *'I speak of thy testimonies before kings'* . . . our opponents can find no fault with our doctrines, and *we, by this Confession, clearly testify and prove, that we have not taught anything wrong or false.*"* What else does Luther here do, but make the Confession his own, and declare his full conviction of the truth of all its doctrines? This too, we take it, is very nearly equivalent to a formal subscription of the Confession.

In the same spirit he writes to the Elector of Saxony, on the 9th of July (just two weeks after the delivery of the confession, and when he had had ample time for considering it in all its aspects): "Our opponents suppose that they have gained an important point, by having had preaching prohibited by his Imperial Majesty's command. But these poor people do not perceive that by the answer of our written confession, more preaching has been done, than any ten preachers could have uttered. . . . Verily, Christ is not silent at the diet; and however they may rave, they must hear more from the confession than they could have heard in a year from preaching."†

Finally, on the 15th of July, he writes in the same vein to Spalatin, Melancthon, Justus Jonas and Agricola, when urging them to leave the Diet and return home: "More has been done than was hoped: you have *'rendered unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are Gods;'* to the Emperor perfect obedience, by attending the Diet at so great expense, labor and trouble; to God the chosen sacrifice of a Confession which shall force its way into all the courts of kings and princes, rule in the midst of its enemies, and go forth with its sound into all the earth, so that those who will not hear are inexcusable. . . . May Christ thus confess us as you have confessed him, and glorify those who glorify him: Amen."‡

At a still later date, Luther expressed himself as follows: "So great is the power of the word of God, that the more it is persecuted, the more it flourishes. Consider the Diet of Augsburg, which is the final triumph before the last day . . . There *our doctrine* so came forward into the light, by means of our Confession, that in a very short time it was sent to all kings, by the command of the Emperor himself. At those

* Briefe IV. p. 72-75.

† Ib. 61-65.

‡ See this and all the other letters of Luther under the date given, in De Wette's "Briefe Luthers."

courts were gathered many of the brightest intellects, and they received this doctrine like tinder, by which a conflagration was then kindled in every direction. Thus our Confession and Apology were published with the greatest glory, whilst their confutation rots in darkness.

Augustae statibus fidei Confessio cunctis

Exposita est; Christi gloria laeta redit."

[At Augsburg was explain'd to all the realm

Our faith's Confession; thus returns Christ's glory.]

Again he writes to the people of Frankfort on the Mayn: "The glorious Confession and Apology are now published to all the world, first confessed and proclaimed at Augsburg before the emperor and highest orders of the Roman empire. In this the papists (although exceedingly hostile to us) can charge us with no fanatical articles. We have not been mum, or guilty of any jugglery, but there stand our clear, free words, without any subterfuge or evasion."*

The conclusion is, therefore, irresistible, that Luther was most fully and thoroughly satisfied with the form which the Augsburg Confession finally took, and in which it was presented to the Diet, and that if he ever did feel any difficulty in regard to it (of which there is no satisfactory evidence), this was entirely removed by his subsequent and mature reflection.

It is, however, alleged that "Luther and his coadjutors, subsequently, still further changed their views on some subjects in that Confession, such as the Mass,"† and that it was the specific object of the Smalkald Articles, which were prepared by Luther, to express these new and clearer views, and thus, as it were, supersede the Augsburg Confession. Such, we are told, were the views of the Elector of Saxony, by whose order Luther drew up the Smalkald Articles. How utterly destitute of all foundation this statement is, is shown by the fact that, at this very time, all the preachers who attended the convention at Smalkald, where these Articles were presented and adopted, at the same time, reaffirmed and subscribed the Augsburg Confession, as follows: "By the command of the most illustrious princes, and orders, and cities, professing the doctrines of the gospel, we have read over the articles of the Confession, exhibited to the Emperor at the Diet of Augsburg, and by the blessing of God, all the preach-

* Coelestin II. 168.

† Luth. Symbols, pp. 56, 57.

ers who are present at this convention of Smalkald, unani-
mously declare that they believe and teach, in their churches,
in accordance with the articles of the Confession and Apolo-
gy. . . . And they therefore subscribe their names." This
declaration, thus signed by Melanchthon and over thirty of
the leading theologians, directly contradicts the assertion
that "no pledge to the Augsburg Confession, or to any other
symbol, was required of the ministers of the church during
Luther's lifetime" (p. 22), in regard to which we have also the
additional and explicit testimony of Melanchthon, that this
regulation of requiring subscription to the Augsburg Confes-
sion, had been introduced at Wittenberg by the advice of Lu-
ther, as early as the year 1532 (almost coeval with the publi-
cation of the Confession), and continued until the time at
which he wrote (1553). So he tells us, in reply to Osiander,
who at that time objected, as our author now does, to such a
subscription of the Augsburg Confession. "This is not a
recent pledge, devised by us," says Melanchthon, "but was
established by our Faculty, over twenty years ago, that is to
say, by Luther, Jonas, and Pomeranus, the pastor of our
church."* In view of such facts, we are at a loss to under-
stand what our author means by asserting the contrary—are
we to understand that he has overlooked this appendage to the
Smalkald Articles, and has never seen Melanchthon's positive
statement?

But this subscription to the Augsburg Confession at Smal-
kald, in 1537, has a bearing still more important. It refutes
most conclusively the charge of opposition between these two
Confessions, and that the latter was designed to supersede the
former, for all the leading theologians of the day signed both
documents, which they could not have done, if they intended
the one to abrogate the other. It is true that Luther's name
is not here subscribed to the Augsburg Confession, but for
this Carpzov, who wrote in the century following the delivery
of the Confession, gives the following sufficient reasons. "Lu-
ther did not subscribe, not only because no one doubted of his
fidelity, and *inasmuch as this subscription had been under-
taken at his suggestion, and by his advice*; but also because
he was at that time very sick," unable in fact to leave his
bed. Of course, there can be no doubt that Luther was will-
ing himself to do that which he recommended for others.

* See Harless "*Votum über die adliche Verpf.*" p. 7.

† Isagoge in Libros Symbolicos p. 933.

It is, moreover, to be borne in mind, that this Convention had express directions, "to read over the Augsburg Confession, from beginning to end, and if they found in it anything differing from the sacred Scriptures, and that doctrine which they set forth in the churches and schools committed to their care, *they should change and correct it.*" Whence it is evident that if either Luther or any one else had regarded the Augsburg Confession as containing any error, he here had a fair opportunity of pointing it out and having it corrected. So too, if there had been any idea of a discrepancy between this and the articles just prepared, it would have been very easy to make the one conform to the other. But although we have very full accounts of all the proceedings at Smalkald, we have not the slightest intimation of anything of this kind.

But it is curious to find this question of the agreement or difference of the Augsburg Confession and Smalkald Articles, again revived in our day, three hundred years after it had been so definitely settled by the Lutheran church, and by all her soundest theologians. The incorporation of both these documents into the Form of Concord, is sufficient evidence of the assurance of the great body of the Lutheran church, as to the entire agreement of these two Confessions. But the fact is, that Lutherans never seem to have had any doubt upon this subject: it was only the enemies of the church, Romanists, Zwinglians or Calvinists, who suggested difficulties. And to all these objections, the defenders of the church replied with the greatest promptness and decision. Thus Calov, in his Introduction to the Symbolical Books,* gives the state of the controversy as follows: "*Do the Smalkald Articles derogate from the authority of the Augsburg Confession?*" which he answers in the negative, giving as his authority, "the Preface to these Articles," which, says he, "shows that the Smalkald Articles explain the Augsburg—so also the history of the Augsburg Confession." In like manner he gives a negative answer to the question, "*Are the Smalkald Articles diametrically opposed to the Augsburg Confession, and do they contain doctrines plainly contrary thereto?*" He also answers in the same way, the question, "*whether the article on the Mass, as here set forth by Luther, is inconsistent with the twenty-fourth article of the Augsburg Confession?*" But surely it never occurred to this profound theologian, whilst thus answering the cavils of Romanists and other opponents, of his day, that these identical objections to

* Pp. 774, 830, etc.

the confessions of the church would, *three hundred years afterwards*, be brought forward by men bearing the name of Lutherans!

It is worthy of notice, that whilst the "Platform" and its defense, which we are now considering, both maintain in broad and general terms, that "Luther and his coadjutors still further changed their views on some subjects in that Confession," they do not make the slightest effort to prove this in reference to anything, except "the mass." The reason of this doubtless is, that they could not find the shadow of evidence in regard to any other point. It was also only by degrees that they could make up their minds to take their present position in regard to the mass. The "Platform" does not directly charge upon the Augsburg Confession, "*the approval of the Romish doctrine of the Mass,*" but only "*of the ceremonies of the Mass,*" and those who charged this upon the Platform, were at first represented as slandering that document by such a statement of its position. But the book before us comes out more boldly, and devotes its longest chapter (V. pp. 63 to 96) to the argument of this point. Here also, the author at first approaches his subject very charily, denies that the "Platform" charges the Confession with anything more than an "approval of the ceremonies of the Mass," but finally comes to the conclusion, that the Augsburg Confession uses the term "Mass," in what he calls "its specific sense" (p. 91) which he defines (p. 70) as "*that long ceremonial, including the consecration of the elements, elevation of the host, and self-communion of the priest, as an offering of the body of Christ a sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead, which preceded the distribution of the sacrament to the people.*" This ceremony, it is asserted, the Augsburg Confession approves and proposes to retain! And yet, in the very same breath, our author is compelled to confess that "*what the Romanists considered as the essential doctrine of the mass, viz: its being a sacrifice of Christ, offered by the priest, and its being offered by him for others than himself, either living or dead, and its being performed at any other time, or for any other purpose than as a preparative for sacramental communion, the Confession rejects!*" This doctrine, it is admitted, the Confession rejects, "*but the outward rite*" it professes to retain. And yet, in the premises by which he endeavors to establish this conclusion, our author himself tells us (p. 71) that Luther, in his "method for conducting christian mass," published in 1523, and serv-

ing as the model for public service in the Protestant church, until the delivery of the Augsburg Confession," *rejected such portions of the Romish mass as he thought wrong;*" how then could the confessors at Augsburg say that they approved of this ceremony, and retained it?

But the sophistry of this self-contradictory argument, is most clearly exhibited by the first three sentences of the very article of the Confession here assailed. We there read:—"Our churches are falsely accused of abolishing the mass. For the mass is retained among us, and is celebrated with the greatest reverence. Nearly all the usual ceremonies are also retained."* Here a clear distinction is made between the *Mass* and its *ceremonies*, and whilst it is positively asserted that the *mass* itself is retained, it is admitted that its *ceremonies* were somewhat changed. This is exactly the opposite of the position taken by our author, who maintains that the ceremonies were retained, whilst the substance or doctrine of the mass was rejected. Of course, they speak of the scriptural, not the Romish mass.

The great point aimed at by our author, is to establish a distinction between the terms "Mass" and "Eucharist," or "Lord's Supper," and to prove that the term "Mass" in the Augsburg Confession, designates the Romish ceremony, and not the Protestant sacrament of the Lord's Supper. This we shall first refute out of the Augsburg Confession itself, and then glance at his other authorities.

It is said (p. 83) that "Melancthon, in translating the Latin original into German, always renders the Latin term for mass (*missa*) by the German term *messe* (mass); whereas, if he had used the Latin term in its more general sense, in Art. XXIV, he would, at least sometimes, have translated it Eucharist or Lord's Supper. But so far as we have examined the word mass (*messe*) is always employed in this article, where the German is a translation of the Latin." It is to be regretted that our author did not examine this subject more carefully than he here professes to have done, as he could not, in that event, have failed to perceive that Melancthon, or his translator, has here done the very thing which he himself admits would have shown that the terms "Mass" and "Lord's Supper," "Eucharist," or "Sacrament," are synonymous or convertible terms. Thus in the fifth paragraph of this Art. XXIV., the Latin reads: "*Quare missa instituta*

* My translation is made from the Latin text.

est," (wherefore *the mass* was instituted) whilst the German is, "So ist das heilige Sacrament eingesetzt" (*the Holy Sacrament* was instituted). And a little further on, it is said in the Latin, "Est igitur ad hoc facienda missa,"* which the German renders, "Derhalben fordert dies Sacrament Glauben." Now it is well known that neither Luther nor Melancthon made two sacraments, one of the Mass, and the other of the Lord's Supper. Neither of them would, therefore, have thought of calling a mere ceremony a sacrament, so that it is evident that no other sacrament than that of the Lord's Supper, can here be meant. The terms "Mass" and "Sacrament," or the Lord's Supper are, therefore, evidently convertible terms.

But still more plainly we are told in the following paragraph that the Mass is nothing else than the "*Communion*," by which term we also designate the Lord's Supper.

"Inasmuch now as the Mass is not a sacrifice for others, living or dead, for the taking away of their sins, but is to be a *communion* in which the priest and others receive the sacrament for themselves: this custom is observed by us, that our holidays, as also at other times, if communicants are present, mass is held, and *those who desire it commune*."† Observe how positively and diametrically this is opposed to our author's statements: *he* says that the Mass was that ceremony which preceded the communion; *the Confession* says that the mass is the communion, and that if no communicants are present, there is no mass. But the Latin text puts the case still more strongly. In this, the seventh paragraph of the article upon the Mass, commences with the sentence: "But Christ commands us to *do it in remembrance of him*" (Luke 22: 19), which are, of course, the words of the institution of the Lord's Supper, and being applied to the Mass, show that it was regarded as the same thing.

This view is abundantly confirmed by the Apology, which is, of course, the very highest authority for the determination of the meaning of the Confession. Having been written at the same time, and by the same person, words are undoubtedly used in the same sense. A few instances will here suffice. The Latin text of the seventh paragraph of the chapter "*On the Mass*," here says: "For we have shown in our Confession that the Lord's Supper (*Coena Domini*) does not con-

* Müller's Symb. Buecher, p. 53

† See the German text of the Confession as above.

fer grace *ex opere operato*." But here the contemporaneous German translation renders the phrase "*Coena Domini*," "*das Abendmahl oder die Messe*" (Lord's Supper or Mass). Again (p. 222 of Müller's Ed.) we have this passage in the German text: "And we have no great objection to any one's applying this to the ceremonies of the Mass, if he do not say that the mere ceremony reconciles to God *ex opere operato*. For as we call preaching a sacrifice of praise, so the ceremony of the *Lord's Supper* may be a sacrifice of praise." And a little further on, in the same paragraph (on p. 256) the phrase *Coena Domini* (Lord's Supper) is again translated, "*Messe oder Abendmahl*" (Mass or Lord's Supper).

There are at least a half dozen other places in which the Apology either speaks of the Mass and the Lord's Supper as equivalent to each other, or gives the phrase "Mass or Lord's Supper" as the translation of the Latin "*Coena Domini*" (Lord's Supper); but we can only refer to the places in which they are found in Müller's edition of the Symbolicall Books: the first and the last paragraphs on page 257; last paragraph on page 259; page 263, next to last paragraph; page 264, 71, 72. On page 269, 94, 95, occurs the passage, "but we object to the performance of the *Lord's Supper* for the dead," instead of the usual phrase "*Mass for the dead*." In a word, we might almost think that the Apology had been careful to translate the phrase "*Coena Domini*," "*Mass or Lord's Supper*," in order to nullify our author's criticism about "*and*" and "*or*" (pp. 83 and 84), and to fulfil his demand that "if he had used the Latin term in its more general sense in Art. XXIV, *he would at least sometimes have translated it eucharist or Lord's Supper*" (see p. 83).

These passages, we think, prove beyond all doubt that the Augsburg Confession, and its legitimate and authorized exposition, the Apology, regard the terms Mass, Lord's Supper, Sacrament and Eucharist, as synonymous, and that there is no foundation whatever for our author's argument to the contrary.

Much less is there any ground for believing that this Article favors what we now properly designate as "the Romish Mass." On the contrary, it is the design of this twenty-fourth article to protest against this very doctrine, and this is the reason why we have here a second article on the Lord's Supper. Every tyro in church history and theology, ought to know that the Augsburg Confession is divided into two parts, the first of which is positive, giving a plain statement

of the doctrines which they believe, and the second negative, and setting forth the corruptions and abuses of both doctrine and practice which they reject. Hence various subjects are taken up twice. Thus we have two articles (XI and XXV) with the same title, "*of Confession*;" two (VII and VIII) "*of the Church*;" three with titles and matter very little differing; XIV, "*of church government*;" XV, "*of church ordinances*, and XXVIII, "*of church power*." So that there is nothing peculiar in the fact that we here find the same number of articles relating to the Lord's Supper, namely, the Tenth, on "*the Lord's Supper*;" the Twenty-second, on "*both kinds in the Sacrament*," and the Twenty-fourth, on "*The Mass*," where it would be just as reasonable to say that "*Sacrament*" meant something different from the "*Lord's Supper*," as that "*Mass*" does. But it is the evident intention of this twenty-fourth article to point out the abuses of the Lord's Supper, practiced under this name. To remove prejudice, the protestants commence by declaring their reverence for the solemn ceremony and ordinance of the Lord's Supper or Mass, and give the assurance that they have no intention of abolishing it. But they do not deny that they had made various changes in the prevalent mode of its celebration, although they put this in the gentlest terms possible. "*Nearly all the usual ceremonies are retained*;" "*public ceremonies, for the most part similar to those in general use, are preserved*."* But they very strongly and decidedly condemn the existing practice of the church of Rome. Thus they say, "*inasmuch as the Mass has been abused in various ways—nor are the bishops ignorant of these abuses—that the Mass is regarded as an atonement for actual sins—a sacrifice for the living and the dead—and Masses are multiplied for purposes of gain*." These are some of the abuses which they endeavored to reform. But in this they maintain that they had the sanction, both of scripture and of the purer ages of the church: "*Christ*," say they, "*commands to do this in remembrance of him*" (Luke 22: 19), "*the Mass as celebrated by us, has the example of the church, as shown by scripture and the fathers*; we have only abolished unnecessary Masses and *priestmasses*" (Pfarrmassen—in which the priest alone communes). Hence it is plain that neither the ceremonies, nor the Mass here retained, are those of the corrupt church

* Latin text.

of Rome, as existing either at the time of the Reformation, or in our day; but where the church of Rome is appealed to, it is expressly declared to be the Rome of early days, not the modern Babylon.* In a word, it was the avowed object of the Reformers to free the Mass from its corruptions, and restore the celebration of the Lord's Supper to its primitive purity.

So much for the teachings of the Confession itself, on this point. Let us now show, as briefly as possible, the sense in which Luther and his cotemporaries use the term Mass in their private writings.

In 1520, ten years before the presentation of the Augsburg Confession, Luther wrote that most celebrated of all his productions—"On the Babylonish Captivity," the object of which was, to show how Rome had corrupted the sacraments, which he declares that she thus held captive. Here having maintained that the cup should be restored to the laity, and refuted the idea of transubstantiation, he proceeds to show the true nature of the Lord's Supper as follows: "OF THE SACRAMENT OF THE ALTAR. In the first place, that we may attain a true and free knowledge of this sacrament, we must, above all things, be careful to separate from its primitive and simple institution, everything that has been added to it by human zeal and passion, such as robes, ornaments, hymns, prayers, music, tapers, and all that pomp of visible things. Let us, then, turn our eyes and minds to Christ's pure institution alone, placing before us nothing but the very word of Christ himself, by which he established, and perfected, and commended this sacrament to us. For in that word, and in nothing else, is contained the power, nature and whole substance of the *Mass*. All other things are human inventions, appendages to the word of God, without which the Mass can be very well celebrated, and continue to exist. But the words of Christ, in which he instituted this sacrament, are as follows: "But as they were eating, Jesus took bread," etc. . Let it therefore stand first and infallibly, that THE MASS OR SACRAMENT OF THE ALTAR is the testament of Christ, which when dying, he left behind him, to be distributed to those who are faithful to him."†

Here we have Luther's definition of the Mass, than which a stronger contrast to Dr. Schmucker's, or more positive con-

* See the Epilogue at the close of Art. XXI.

† Lutheri Opera Latina Tom. II. 96. 279. Jenae 1557.

tradition of the sense in which he declares Luther to have used the term, could not be well given. Not only does he use the expression "*Mass* or *Sacrament of the Altar*," but he likewise declares that the "*ceremonies*," in which Dr. S. makes it entirely to consist, have nothing whatever to do with its essence. It is also well known that in this celebrated work ("*The Babylonish Captivity*") Luther attacks and rejects nearly all of the Romish corruptions of the Lord's Supper, including *Transubstantiation*, the Sacrifice, merit derived from it, opus operatum, and the like. Such were his views just ten years before the delivery of the Augsburg Confession, in which it is absurd to suppose that he would consent that anything different should be placed, as we find that instead of receding from these views, he became continually more and more decided in their maintenance.

Altogether accordant with this are the views embodied in Luther's "*Formula for Mass and Communion*," written in 1523, and in which Dr. Schmucker insists (pp. 70, 71) that a broad distinction is drawn between the two. On the contrary, we here find the strongest proof that they are identical. Thus in the first paragraph, we find this language: "For we cannot deny this, that *masses* and the *communion of bread and wine* are a rite divinely instituted by Christ himself, which was, at first, observed under Christ himself, and then under the apostles, most simply and piously, and without any additions;"* where they are spoken of together as one rite. And upon the same page he proceeds to say: "In this book we omit saying that the Mass is not a sacrifice or work of a sacrifice, which we have elsewhere abundantly shown. *Let us understand it as a Sacrament or testament*, or, as the Latins say, *benediction*, or the Greeks *Eucharist*, or the table of the Lord, or the *Lord's Supper*, or the memory of the Lord, or the *Communion*, or whatever pious name you please to use, only let it not be polluted with the title of a sacrifice or a work (meritorious), and let us exhibit the rite as we think it ought to be performed."† How Luther could more plainly

* *Missas et communionem panis et vini ritum esse a Christo divinitus institutum, etc.*—Luth. Op. II, 589-595.

† "Verum hoc libro dicere omittimus, missam non esse sacrificium seu opus sacrificantis, quod alias abunde docuimus. Apprehendamus eam ut sacramentum seu testamentum, seu benedictionem Latine, Eucharistiam Græce, vel mensam Domini, vel coenam Domini, vel memoriam Domini, vel communionem, vel quocumque nomine pio placet, modo sacrificii aut operis titulo non polluat, et ritum monstremus, quo visum est nobis illa uti." Contrast this denial of the sacrificial character of

tell us that he uses the terms Mass, Sacrament, Eucharist, Lord's Supper and Communion as synonymous, we are at a loss to imagine.

But two circumstances have here created difficulty in the minds of those who are not familiar with Luther's style, which abounds in what rhetoricians call *hendiadys*, or the use of two words in the same case, where the ordinary construction would put them in different cases; the first is, that the phrase "Mass and Communion" is employed as though *two* different services were to be considered, and the other that after having spoken of the Mass in general, he considers the communion of the congregation more particularly. Now that the first objection has no weight, is shown by the fact, that in Luther's Latin works (Jena 1557) the title at the head is from beginning to end, "*Formula Missae*" (Formula for Mass) except in one instance (f. 590), where it reads "*Formula Missae seu Com.*" (Formula for Mass or Communion.) As to the division of the subject, the first part treats of the subject in general, and of the priest's duties in its administration; the second part, of the qualifications and procedure of the communicants. That the Mass here embraces the communion of the congregation, is shown by the sixth point, which is as follows: "Then let him both take the Communion himself, and administer it to the people."* So also, in the second part, when speaking of the Communion of the people (on f. 591) he employs the term "Mass," thus: "Again, when *Mass* is celebrated, those who are about to commune should stand together, apart from the rest, in one body."

It may be, also, that Luther employed the phraseology "Mass and Communion," in order to distinguish this service from the private Mass, in which the priest alone communed, which he considered as one of the abuses of the Mass, and against which he had, in the preceding year (1522), written his well known treatise, "*On the Abrogation of Private Mass.*" But even this Mass was only a perversion of the Lord's Supper, as is evident from the second part of Luther's discussion, where he speaks "*of the words of the Mass,*" which he cites from the three Evangelists, and from St. Paul (1 Cor. 11) according to the words of the institution,† in re-

the Mass with Müller's view, in his "*Symbolism,*" p. 315. where its sacrificial character is the essence of the Mass.

* Ubi supra f. 590.

† De Abroganda Missa privata. Luth. Op. Lat. II. 465—494.

gard to which he says (f. 474): "We shall now, in the second place, after our wars, show the same thing by peaceful proofs, and quietly building upon the foundation just laid, adapting our language to our object, shall treat of the Mass itself, in reliance, not as the priests of Satan do, upon our own words, but only upon those of God. Wherefore let us hear the institution of the Mass from the beginning, and the words of its institutor. But they are as follows: The first is in Matthew 26: "But as they were eating," &c. In accordance with these views, adverse to all private masses, he commences the second part of his "Formula," which might be called his "Manual for the celebration of Mass," with the following statement: "So much for the Mass and service of the minister or bishop. Now we shall speak of the ceremony of administering the communion to the people, on account of which chiefly that supper of the Lord was instituted, and is called by that name." Here he evidently means to say that the communion of the congregation was the great object for which the Mass was instituted, as is also further evident from what he immediately adds: "For as it is most absurd for a minister of the word to be so foolish as to proclaim the word where no one is present as a hearer, and to cry aloud to himself alone, amid rocks and woods, or in the vacant air, so it is most perverse if the ministers prepare the public supper of the Lord where there are no guests to eat and drink, and they who ought to minister to others, eat and drink alone, in an empty hall, and at a vacant table. Wherefore if we would truly follow the example of Christ, no private Mass should be left in the church, unless this infirmity also should be tolerated for a season." Here, again, Luther most pointedly condemns that which Dr. S. represents him as establishing, viz: a service or Mass separate and distinct from the Communion. And he does the same thing in his letter to Lazarus Spangler in 1528, where he says that "all masses at which there are no communicants, should be absolutely omitted;" that is to say, the Mass and the Communion service are the same thing, and, as a matter of course, there should be no service where there are no communicants. But if the two things were entirely distinct, as Dr. S. represents, there could have been no reason why the one should not be performed without the other. We are therefore surprised that Dr. S. does not see this manifest bearing of the several passages of this kind which he cites from Luther in his book, pp. 71—73.

Still clearer is this in regard to the passage quoted from the "Exhortation to the Sacrament," where Luther says, "I make neither the Mass nor the Sacrament a sacrifice, *but the remembrance of Christ*," where, instead of any antithesis, we find both represented as signifying the same thing, viz: "*the remembrance of Christ*."

But this fact ought to put an end to all controversy as to Luther's views of the identity of the Mass and the Lord's Supper: in 1519 he delivered a "*Sermon on the Sacrament of the Altar*,"* in which this passage occurs: "Above all things, we must most carefully remember the words in which Christ instituted this Sacrament, as follows: 'Our Lord Jesus in the night in which he was betrayed, took bread, and when he had given thanks, brake it and gave it to his disciples, saying, take eat,' etc. But in his treatise 'on the abrogation of private Mass,'† written two years afterwards, he quotes this same passage of scripture, in order to explain the institution of the Mass thus: 'Wherefore let us hear the words of the institution of the Mass. But they are these: 'But as they were eating, Jesus took bread,' etc. Christ is thus represented as instituting both the Lord's Supper and the Mass, in the same language, at the same time and place, and that Luther regards them as identical, is as little to be doubted as that he has thus expressed himself.

How then are we to understand Luther, where in the Smalcald Articles (II) he says, "*That the Mass in the papacy is the greatest and most horrible abomination*." Plainly he means, as he also says, *the papal doctrine of the Mass*," which the Augsburg Confession also distinctly rejects, when it protests against the abuses of the Mass in the second, third, fourth, fifth and sixth paragraphs of the Article upon that subject, which also contain the substance of what Luther says in the Smalcald Article.

We have already shown by our quotations from the Apology, how Melancthon used the term Mass. But the following extract from the seventeenth article of his "Synopsis," prepared at the request of Valdez, the Secretary of Charles V., as some say, for the personal satisfaction of the emperor, and bearing the date of June 18 (just a week before the delivery of the Augsburg Confession) is so plain and pointed, as almost to supersede the necessity for all further proof or illustration: "*Of the Mass*." We, in accordance with the sacred

* Opera Lat. I., 347.

† Ibid. II., 475.

scriptures, name that rite most simply the Lord's Supper, according to 1 Cor. 11, not only because those words of Paul confirm our views, but because the learning of antiquity supports us in such language, where we read that it was customary that in every church, Mass should be celebrated, in which mass the presbyter gave those who desired it, the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, to eat and to drink. . . . Some of the ancients called this rite "ἀγάπην" (the love-feast) "because this union is, as it were, a pledge of mutual love among the pious, and because formerly loaves of bread, and similar things, were brought for distribution to the poor. Finally, we celebrate Masses, not that they may be empty, vain and ridiculous spectacles, but that in such meetings the sacrament of the true body and blood of Christ may be administered and distributed according to his direction and command." Here also we have another article (the sixth) "On the use of the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ," where, after having stated the nature and design of the sacrament, he adds: "This use is manifestly changed and perverted in the Papal Mass and Canon."*

So also the following "judgment of Philip Melancthon, written at Augsburg in the month of July 1530," and contained in the second volume of Coelestin's History, p. 278, is so clear as scarcely to require a word of comment. "Only five views," says he, "can be entertained in regard to the Mass. . . . The first view is, that the *Lord's Supper* is a feast established among christians. . . . The second is not very different from this, namely, that the Supper was instituted as a mark of their profession, whereby christians may be distinguished from others. . . . The third view is that of Luther, which I also regard as most accordant with the truth, that the Supper was instituted, not that we might there offer the body of Christ, but that something may be offered to us, that is to say, that it may be a sacrament," &c.

Here we find Melancthon using the terms Mass and Lord's Supper as perfect equivalents for each other, and there is not a syllable to be found in any of his writings of this period, that does not show that he regarded the Mass and the Communion as inseparable.

As to the Lord's Supper and the Mass being separately mentioned by Melancthon, it is no evidence of diversity in the two things, any more than the separate mention of the

* Coelestin I. 93—101.

Lord's Supper and the two kinds in the Lord's Supper; they are only different aspects of the same subject. It was agreed upon all sides, that the Lord's Supper was to be observed, but what was the nature of the Lord's Supper, whether bread and wine should both be distributed to the communicants, when and where, and with what ceremonies this rite should be performed, were all different questions. It was to the last of these, namely, how the Lord's Supper should be dispensed, that the discussions under the head of the Mass related.—The Romanists maintained that it was enough for the priest alone to take the Eucharist; that he might administer it to himself, either in public or in private; and that an atonement was thus made for sin, and grace conferred upon any one to whom the priest chose to apply it. The Protestants, on the contrary, insisted that the Mass should always be public, and that it must be participated in by others besides the priest—that it was a communion of the members of the church with each other, as well as with Christ, and that for the priest alone to participate in it, was utterly subversive of its design, and inconsistent with its nature. Thus there were three great questions to be answered in regard to the Lord's Supper:—First, what is its nature? Secondly, is it to be administered to the laity in both kinds, that is to say, with the two elements of bread and wine? And thirdly, is it proper for the priest to celebrate it in private, and to confine its participation to himself alone? This last was the great question discussed under the head of the Mass, in regard to the ceremonies of which, the Protestants were but little concerned. The great point with them was, shall we allow the Lord's Supper to be entirely taken away from the people, or shall we insist upon the public nature of this service, as a communion of the whole congregation of the faithful? This, and questions growing out of this, were the points discussed under the title of the Mass. By the invention of transubstantiation, the cup had been taken away from the people, and by another application of the same doctrine, namely, that the priest, by receiving the elements thus changed into the body and blood of Christ, offered a sacrifice and made an atonement for the sins of the living and the dead, they were preparing to take away the other element also.

Hence Melancthon employs the language so inaccurately translated, and so irrelevantly quoted by Dr. S. on page 78 of the book before us, which should read as follows: "That the *Mass* is not a work which, applied to others, can merit

for them grace *ex opere operato*, but the *Lord's Supper* is, as the whole church confesses, a sacrament through which grace is offered to the recipient, and which the recipient does not attain *ex opere operato*, but through faith, if he believes that grace and the remission of sins are there offered to him.* Here "Mass" and "Lord's Supper" are evidently the same thing, the contrast lying not in these terms, but in "merit" and "grace," "works" and "faith."

In short, the Augsburg Confession and Apology, Luther and Melancthon, in the Smalkald Articles, and in their other writings, use the term "Mass" just as all other writers of that period do. What that usage was, is sufficiently set forth by George Major, who, in a work written in 1557, and sanctioned by a preface from Melancthon, thus expresses himself: "The Mass is the office in which the minister administers and dispenses the sacrament to others. . . . That such a distribution is the Mass, the institution itself testifies. . . . In Basil's time the Mass was nothing else than the communion." Or if we wish the highest authority in the theology of the Lutheran church, we may take that of Gerhard: "The Latin writers everywhere repeat these Greek appellations, calling the Holy Supper Eucharist. . . . They call it also the sacrament of the altar. They employ, moreover, the term Mass. The true Mass is that sacred office of divine worship in which the Eucharist is consecrated and distributed."

That this usage is not peculiar to Lutheran writers, is well known. Bucer, Calvin, Turretin, the great Reformers of the church of England, as well as of the continent, all employ the term Mass in the same way, as synonymous with the Lord's Supper. So well established is this fact, that Dr. Hook, one of the most recent English writers, in his "Church Dictionary" thus defines the Mass: "*The Mass*, from signifying the church service in general, came at length to signify the communion service in particular, and so that that most emphatically came to be called *Mass*."

In view of all these facts, we must be allowed to express our surprise that our author has been willing to risk, we will not say the peace of the church, but even his theological reputation, in so desperate an attempt as that of contradicting all christian antiquity, and all the theology of the Reformation, in regard to the use of the term Mass. We can readily

* See the original in Coelestin II. 68.

understand how an English or an American divine might fall into such a mistake, but how one trained in the Lutheran church, familiar with its church usages, and having as household words, its great theological names, Chemnitz, Hutter, Gerhard, Carpzov, Calov, Quenstedt and Buddeus, should so mistake facts, and be led into a position so utterly untenable, we are at a loss to conceive. But certainly it does seem to us almost too absurd for argument, that this doctrine of the Romish Mass should have been in the Augsburg Confession, and yet neither Luther nor Melancthon, nor any of the mighty host of Lutheran divines who have adorned the annals, and sustained the honor of the church for more than three centuries, have known anything about it. For our part, we shall certainly remain content to believe with them that there is nothing either of the Romish Mass or of its ceremonies, in this most glorious symbol of our church.

Having found our author so unsafe and unsatisfactory a guide in regard to the main point which he labors to establish, it is scarcely worth while to go into a minute examination of his other positions. In regard to these we have much to say, for there is scarcely a single position which he assumes, that is not radically unsound, or that does not do gross and glaring injustice, either to the person, the doctrine, or the church (Lutheran) which he assails. But a few brief illustrations of our meaning must suffice.

Of this injustice, perhaps no one has more reason to complain (but he is fortunately beyond the "*rabies theologorum*" from which he so earnestly prayed to be delivered) than "the great schoolmaster of Germany," the bosom friend of Luther, the gentle Melancthon. Assailed with the fiercest invectives during his lifetime, and even after his death, for making so many concessions to the Reformed, or extreme Protestant party, he is here denounced for having sacrificed the Reformation to the Romanists. He is represented as having made such concessions, and so altered the Augsburg Confession, that Luther was deeply dissatisfied, not to say disgusted with him. But no representations could be more groundless—of which this is sufficient proof—During all this time he was in constant correspondence with Luther, consulted him at every step, and enjoyed his unabated confidence, both then and throughout his life; in proof of which, we might cite scores, if not hundreds of Luther's letters. But we shall content ourselves with a single citation. After all these rumors of concessions, weakness, treachery and the like, on the part of

Melanchthon, Luther thus writes to him on the 11th of September, 1530: "Grace and peace in the Lord. It seems to me an age since you last wrote to me that the conference was at an end. . . . I begin to grow sick with the long delay of your return. . . . But, what I had almost forgotten, I beg you, my dear Philip, *not to trouble yourself with the judgments of those who either say or write that you have yielded too much to the Papists.* For some of our friends must needs be weak, whose ways and weakness you should endure, unless you would despise Paul, according to Rom. 15: 1.* So much for those who seek to embroil Luther and Melanchthon. All such attempts were fruitless during their lifetime, and now that they have rested together for nearly three centuries, we do not think that even the ashes, and much less the blessed spirits of those noble martyrs, will be disturbed.

In regard to private Confession and Absolution, the representations of the book before us are more reasonable, and less destitute of foundation. But even here, great injustice is done to the Confession, and positions of a most dangerous character are taken. First, no adequate idea of private confession, as approved by the Augsburg Confession, is given, inasmuch as attention is not directed to the fact that it was designed for enlightening the ignorant and consoling the disturbed and anxious conscience, as is sufficiently set forth in the Confession and Apology, but more particularly explained in Luther's "Brief Admonition to Confession," commonly given as an appendix to the Larger Catechism.

Secondly, its *voluntary* character, though admitted, is not properly considered. That this puts it in its true position of pastoral care and conversation with individuals, in regard to their spiritual condition, is evident. What faithful minister does not desire to converse with his people in regard to the state of their souls, to awaken the careless, to reclaim backsliders, and to give the consolations and assurance of the gospel to the weak and humble, though doubting believer? Who will say that the minister, the pastor shall not converse privately with any one, and especially with the members of his flock who feel the burden of sin upon their souls, and who dare say that he shall not announce the certainty of God's

* De Wette Luther's Briefe, IV. 162. We must here also express our surprise at Dr. Schmucker's translation of a passage in Melanchthon's letter to Campegius, p. 52, where he renders "*reuerenter colimus*," we reverently pledge obedience," instead of "we sincerely respect." Here also he appears to be misled by a German translation.

forgiveness to the penitent and believing? But this is all that is included in Private Confession and Absolution.

Thirdly, the fact is not considered that the *forms* of Confession and Absolution are a matter of church discipline, and may, therefore, according to Lutheran principles, be changed and regulated according to circumstances.

Fourthly, the impression is conveyed that the minister here professes to forgive sin in his own name, or by his own power (see pp. 104—106), than which nothing could be more unjust, alike to the letter and to the spirit of the church and her Confessions. The Reformation itself started with the contradiction of this error. The fifth and sixth propositions in Luther's memorable "*Ninety-five Theses*," which were the first blast of the trumpet of the Reformation, declare:— 5. "*The Pope neither wishes nor is able to remit any punishment of sin, except that which he has imposed of his own pleasure and that of the canons.*" 6. "*The Pope cannot remit any sin, except declaratively, and by expressing his approbation of God's remission of the same.*"* Of course, if the Pope cannot forgive sin personally, or by his own power, much less can the priest or minister. So Sylvester Prierias understood the matter when, in opposition to these propositions of Luther, he said: "Not only the Pope, but every priest remits sins officially and ministerially."† Such a doctrine, the worst form of the *opus operatum*, would have been utterly subversive of the great doctrine of Justification by faith alone, and it is utterly out of the question to suppose that any part of the Confession can favor it. Nor do the quotations from the "Form of Confession" convey such an idea. When the minister there asks, "believest thou that my forgiveness is God's forgiveness?" he simply means to say, "do you believe that the forgiveness which I offer is God's forgiveness," the person confessing being taught to request the minister not to "forgive his sins," but to "*announce to him*" the divine forgiveness. At the same time are we free to say, that we object to this form of Confession (which is no part of our Confession of faith), as unsuitable to the present state of christian society and life, and moreover, liable to be misunderstood.

Fifthly, the position taken (pp. 103—106) *that the forgiveness of sin is not to be announced to individuals, or that the*

* Luther Opera Latina I, fol. II, b.

† Ibid. fol. XVII.

penitent and believing are not to be assured of the free and full pardon of their sins, is utterly subversive of the gospel, and of the ministerial office. For what is the gospel but the announcement of grace, the favor of God, and the forgiveness of sins through our Lord Jesus Christ? And of what value is the gospel to a penitent soul, if the minister cannot assure it in answer to its anxious inquiry, 'What must I do to be saved?' that faith in Christ is the pledge of its salvation? And it is a most startling announcement, *that no individual is to be assured of his salvation, that not "even the inspired apostles, in a single instance, undertook to announce the pardon of sin to any individual personally!"* How then are we to understand Peter's first sermon in Acts 2: 38, where, in answer to the question, "Men and brethren what shall we do?" he replies, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Did he not thus assure *every one* whom he baptized, individually, of the remission of his sins? And so when Philip baptized the eunuch (Acts 8: 38), he undoubtedly gave him the same individual and personal assurance, when he baptized him for the remission of his sins. Such a system robs the ministry of its richest consolations, and consigns souls mourning under the burthen of sin, to the most wretched uncertainty. But we only call public attention to this new doctrine, not proposing to examine it any further at this time.

Not the least unreasonable part of this unreasonable assault upon the Augsburg Confession, and this elaborate fault-finding with it, is that which relates to the so called "Christian Sabbath," or divine institution of the Lord's Day. For, in the first place, the Augsburg Confession does not professedly discuss this subject, does not make an article of faith of it, one way or the other, and should not, therefore, be held responsible for the opinions of its adherents, in regard to it.—Reference is only made incidentally to the subject, under the twenty-eighth article, which relates to "Ecclesiastical Power." The greater part of the article is directed against traditions, and it is only incidentally stated, in regard to the Sabbath, that the Bishops have no power to change the Decalogue, to transfer the Sabbath from one day to another, or to burthen the conscience with their ceremonial arrangements. But when it is said "that the ordinance concerning Sunday instead of the Sabbath, was not enacted as necessary, and that the ob-

servance of neither the Sabbath nor any other day is necessary," it is to be understood as previously expressed, that it is not "necessary to salvation," that is, that the observance of Sunday is not a meritorious work, or one that secures salvation. It is, therefore, a very serious misrepresentation, when Dr. Schmucker says (p. 117) that the Augsburg Confession teaches "(b) that those who suppose that the ordinance concerning Sunday instead of Sabbath, is enacted as necessary, are greatly mistaken," for it teaches just the contrary, declaring in so many words that the appointment of a particular day for divine service "*is necessary*." Nor is it involved in anything stated in the Confession, that the substitution of Sunday for the Sabbath, was not of *apostolic origin*. When it is said that "the christian church appointed Sunday," the reference is naturally to the apostolic church, which the confessors undoubtedly regarded as guided by the apostles, and as receiving especial communications of the will of God and the mind of Christ, through them. It is true that we have no record of an apostolic injunction for the establishment or observance of Sunday, but as we can trace its observance up to that period, we are assured that it had the sanction of the apostles, and was, in all probability, appointed by them. The Confession declares that the observance of Sunday was established by the church, and doubtless means the apostolic church, and thus gives it an apostolic, that is, a divine sanction.

But it is a very singular charge against the Augsburg Confession, with which Dr. Schmucker begins to sum up his case, that, "Here we are distinctly taught, (a) that the Jewish Sabbath is entirely abolished," as though this were a most dangerous heresy. Is it not a matter of fact that the Jewish Sabbath is abolished? Does any one but Seventh day Baptists and similar Sabbatarians, deny this? Does any one pretend that the Lord's day and the Jewish Sabbath are the same? To be sure, our learned friend, Dr. Seyffarth, maintains that the first day of our week is the original seventh, but that is still a different point, and the transfer of the Sabbath has never hitherto been defended upon that ground. But we fear that this statement was intended to make the impression that the Augsburg Confession is opposed to the observance of the Lord's day, and that this is to be added to the numerous instances in which the Platform and this, its commentary, endeavor to excite odium against the Confession. If this is the object, we protest against it in the name, not

only of christian charity and truth, but of everything that is honest and honorable among men.*

Finally, our author does gross injustice to the Confession, and grievous injury to the church, by his representations of the views therein inculcated in regard to the nature and efficacy of the sacraments. Although he does not make the charge in so many words, it is implied in the whole drift of his argument, that the Augsburg Confession, and other symbols of the Lutheran church, favor, if they do not inculcate what is commonly called "*a sacramental religion*," or a system in which the sacraments are the great source, the beginning and the end of spiritual life. Now, whilst it is true that Lutheranism and its Confessions do attach more importance to the sacraments than those who regard them as mere outward signs or representatives of spiritual blessings, it is, on the other hand, certain that their fundamental principle of justification by faith alone, is utterly subversive of all such ideas. Accordingly, we find that Puseyism has no sympathy whatever with Lutheranism. Nowhere, except among Romanists, will you find Luther and the Reformation so bitterly denounced, as among English Tractarians and Puseyites. The doctrine of Justification by faith, is the object of their special abhorrence, and they very well understand, if our author does not, the force of the thirteenth article of the Augsburg Confession, "On the use of the sacraments." Here the concluding sentence cuts up all such theories of sacramental justification by the roots, when it is said, "They, therefore, condemn those who teach that the sacraments justify *ex opere operato*, and that faith which believes that our sins are pardoned, is not required in the use of the sacraments."

How, in view of such plain language as this, and upon this specific subject, can our author justify such statements as he makes upon p. 123, where he says, that "the symbols seem to regard forgiveness of sins, that is, justification, as the immediate effect of every worthy reception of these ordinances; they speak as though, in those who do believe, it was the sacrament, and not their faith in the Redeemer, which secured the blessing;" but also the whole drift of his argument which, without declaring this to be the doctrine of our Confessions,

*See the Evangelical Review for January 1857, Art. II, for an able discussion of the Sabbath by Rev. C. Porterfield Krauth; which supersedes the necessity of our entering more minutely into this question, as does also the first Article of the same No. on "Baptismal Regeneration," any further discussion by us, of the general principles involved in that topic.

leaves it to be inferred, and undoubtedly conveys this idea to the great mass of his readers. Such a mode of argument, or rather of innuendo, for it really amounts to little more, can certainly never satisfy the intelligent and candid inquirer, and should only excite the stern reprobation of all who aim at the acquisition of simple, unadulterated and unperverted truth. There is no more certain mode of exciting prejudice than this, for it is taken for granted that these errors, so boldly set forth, and so strongly denounced, are, of course, contained in the documents under consideration, and they are, accordingly, condemned in advance, without a hearing.

Having shown that Dr. Schmucker's premises in regard to the nature and efficacy of the sacraments, as set forth in our Symbolical Books, are entirely erroneous, it would be superfluous for us to enter upon an examination of their application to Baptism and the Lord's Supper, nor would our limits, upon this occasion, admit of it. We only direct attention to the fact, that the Augsburg Confession employs simply the language of scripture, in those points to which Dr. Schmucker takes his chief exceptions. He emphasises the words,—*"born again by Baptism and the Holy Spirit,"* but how does this differ from the declaration in John 3: 5; *"Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot see the kingdom of God."* So also he seems to have equal aversion to the phraseology that the Lord's Supper presents to us *"the true body and blood of Christ,"* and yet our Savior himself says, in John 6: 54, *"Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day."* Hence we infer that, as the scriptures are the great standard by which all doctrines and all systems are to be tested, that the presumption is, so far at least, on the side of the Confessions which thus seek to conform their teachings to the divine word.

But these are subjects that require fuller elucidation than we can here pretend to give them, and we leave them to others who will, doubtless, examine with that thoroughness for which they call our author's theories, both of the sacraments in general, and of regeneration, justification and sanctification. Attention has recently been turned to these subjects, as well as to his peculiar theory of native depravity, and some other fundamental doctrines of christianity, and we trust that the matter will be thoroughly investigated, as its seriousness and magnitude demand. We have only endeavored to give a general view of the book, and to elucidate one

or two points, and now leave it to others to do justice to those aspects of our author's performance, to which we could, upon this occasion, only allude in general terms.

ARTICLE II.

ISRAEL AND THE GENTILES.*

By the Rev. H. I. Schmidt, D. D., New York.

HISTORY does not furnish a more striking or imposing evidence of its supreme control of human affairs, in accordance with its own will and infinitely wise purposes, than we have in the origin, rise, growth, vicissitudes, calamities and final dispersion of the Hebrew nation, the object first of prophecy and promise, next of wonderfully glorious fulfilment, afterwards of terrible denunciations, the accomplishment of which has been rolling along with the lapse of centuries; and nothing can more signally confirm the truth of sacred history and prophecy, than the record of Israel's national life and death. The world does not contain a more stupendous monument of the infinite power, wisdom and righteousness of the divine government, than Israel's distinct existence among the nations of the earth since the calling and emigration of Abraham (A. M. 2083: B. C. 1921), down to the present day; a period of 3778 years. This distinctness of Israel as a peculiar people, at one time enjoying a national existence contemptible or glorious, at another in disgraceful bondage to neighboring nations: now dwelling in peace and plenty on the soil of promised Canaan, the tribes coming up annually from far and near to the temple of the city of David; then defying for years the embattled forces of imperial Rome; and at length, after seeing the temple burned, and Jerusalem laid waste, scattered to the four winds of heaven, dispersed among all the other nations that dwell on the face of the earth; and yet, always remaining essentially one, a nation separate from all others and altogether peculiar, retaining its own religion,

* Israel and the Gentiles. Contributions to the History of the Jews, from the earliest times to the present day. By Dr. Isaac Da Costa, of Amsterdam. New York: Robert Carter and Brothers, Broadway. 1855.

institutions, rites, usages, language and laws: this, we say, presents a phenomenon so unique, so marvellously singular, so entirely unparalleled, that the man who, with the writings of the prophets before him, cannot here discern the finger of God, and recognize the directing and controlling power of divine Providence, must be afflicted with a degree of mental blindness and obtuseness, to which no amount of pity can bear any appreciable proportion. The national career of Israel, their many extraordinary vicissitudes, their denationalized, but continued and perfectly distinct existence, through eighteen centuries of oppressions and persecutions unequalled in the history of mankind, this phenomenon possesses all the attributes of a stupendous miracle, that sets at nought all human experience concerning the fate of nations: a miracle so striking that, while to us it is confirmation strong of the truth of divine Revelation, our modern philosophers are under the most solemn obligation to their own avowed doctrines or principles, to disbelieve it and utterly to deny that such a being as a Jew, to say nought of the Jewish people, ever existed. Or is this one link in that chain of necessity, of necessary sequence, which, according to modern philosophers, cannot be broken? Certainly human history knows of nothing else remotely resembling it. The first empire of which we read, with its vast, proud capital, is gone, and for some thousand years nobody knew where that capital had stood, until it was recently dug up again out of the sands of the desert. Babylon, with all of which it once was the mighty centre, is gone. The empire of the Medes and Persians, with all its power and glory, is gone. Egypt can now be found only in the museums of Europe and America: it lives only in its colossal ruins, its pyramids, and its hieroglyphics which scholars have only within a few years past learned how to read and interpret. All that remains of that city, whose merchants were princes, and whose commerce compassed the world, is a few fisher-huts. Athens, the brilliant home of philosophy, letters and art; Sparta, the burly mother of a rugged race, mighty as a school for war, and in its stern patriotism, are the worn out themes of prize poems and of beard lessorators at college commencements. To Rome, once the world's proud and bloody mistress, nothing is left save the ancient metropolis itself and the circumjacent country, wretchedly misgoverned by a silly old priest, whilst of the great empire itself, it would not even be true to say, "*stat nominis umbra*:" the very shadow has flitted away. Of these nations several oppressed,

some led captive, the Hebrews; the last-named destroyed their city, broke up their commonwealth, and scattered the nation to wander homeless over the face of the earth: *they* are gone, whilst Israel remains. It is true, the Chinese empire, and the empire of Japan claim to be some thousands of years old; but they have been shut up within themselves, and left to themselves by others: nobody has meddled with them from without: nobody has conquered them, persecuted or sought to exile their people. The Mongol and Mandshu conquest of China cannot be taken into account here; for it left its petrified culture and political organization untouched:—both empires are nothing but mummies, embalmed by a process which preserves and perpetuates a torpid and sluggish organization. But in the midst of this ever changing world, in which empires, dynasties and nationalities are coming on the stage, playing their part, and passing away, and concerning which the law of decay and death is the only law which altereth not, the Jewish people have remained—and remained the same. Their national existence terminated, their city and temple utterly destroyed, the population driven from its beloved soil, the Hebrews have, ever since, been found a distinct and a peculiar people, scattered over the whole face of the earth, dispersed among all nations, undergoing hardships, persecutions and sufferings, which would long since have utterly exterminated any people, for whose preservation almighty power was not specially pledged and exerted. The history of such a people, even without any reference to the church of God and human salvation, would be one of profound interest. Of this history, we mean the history subsequent to the dispersion, we have a spirited and exceedingly interesting narrative in the volume before us. We design, if our space should permit, to communicate in these pages a variety of other interesting matter concerning the modern Jews; but it will be our first duty to give an account of Dr. Da Costa's admirable work, and to present copious extracts from its pages.

Since the commencement of the present century a number of works of considerable value and interest have appeared, treating of the condition, political, moral and religious, of the Jews of our day; but they refer either to particular localities inhabited by this people, or to some special affairs concerning them; and we know of no work which presents, like this, a complete history of the Hebrews; in their connections with and relations to the gentiles, from the time of Moses down to

the present day. This is the design of the work before us. "In my Lectures on Jewish History," says the author, "which form the groundwork of this sketch, I have endeavored to notice especially the relations of my people with all the nations of the world, from the earliest days of their existence to the present time; to remark upon what the Gentiles are for the Jews, either as means of instruction or of chastisement, and what Israel has been, and still is, for the Gentiles, either as witnesses to the truth, and victims of their own unbelief, or as the people kept apart, to impart light and salvation to the Gentiles."—p. x. sq. Yet he disavows every pretension to his work being considered a regular history, or even an attempt at one. "A universal history of the Jews in modern times, relating to their wanderings, and entering into the details of their manners, customs, literature and biography, on the scale of Basnage, but written in a more correct and interesting manner, with the additional light which time and science have now thrown upon the subject, is still to be desired. What is here brought forward, can only be considered as the contribution of a stone to the building; for we have but attempted a glance into the chaos of materials, though a glance happily directed may, perhaps, lead to a discovery valuable to science, or the confirmation of faith."—p. x.

Surely there is no people on earth, whose history, whose state and prospects can possess a greater interest for christians, than those of the Jews, the vessels by means of which the truth and worship of the true God were preserved among men; the channel through which salvation came into our world. And while, therefore, we fully agree with our author in regarding a universal history of the Jews in modern times as a desideratum, we would fain hope that he will himself be induced to undertake the vast labor of supplying it. He possesses peculiar qualifications for executing the work in a manner most acceptable and satisfactory to protestant christendom. Himself a descendant of one of those Jewish families who, in the seventeenth century, sought refuge in the Netherlands from the persecutions of Spain and Portugal, he had, from his earliest youth, made the history of his forefathers "an object of meditation and study;" but it was the task of exploring the annals of Israel's dispersion and exile, that captivated his heart and imagination. His eager search for the reason why his people continued to be a nation, after having lost all the requisites usually essential to a national existence, led, through the grace of God, to his most decided

conversion to christianity. "More than a quarter of a century has now elapsed since the epoch which decided the fate of my whole life, and yet Israel's history, as written in the book of books, or found in the scattered records of their eighteen hundred years of exile, has never ceased to occupy my thoughts, and to employ a portion of my time. While entering into the details of this wondrous history, I have discovered more and more its perfect harmony with the dispensations of God, and the declarations of his word; and the Jewish nation has been brought to my view more strikingly as an abiding testimony to the truth of the christian religion, a living commentary upon the Scriptures, a certain pledge of the entire fulfilment of prophecy."—p. ix.

If to these brief personal notices we add, that the author is a man of extensive and profound erudition, and that he had access to the most valuable materials belonging to his field of inquiry, it will, we think, be evident that he is a most competent witness, one most likely to present the subject in a manner gratifying and interesting to protestant christians.

Profound, indeed, and varied is the interest of this subject. The remote antiquity of their origin, so firmly established by the testimony of tradition and history, that no candid mind for a moment questions it, alone constitutes the Hebrew nation an object of the deepest interest. "This people is the only nation that can, with certainty, trace its origin, through one family, to a single individual." "As children of Abraham, guardians and confessors of the law of Moses and the predictions of the prophets, they bear, by a personal mark, the testimony of their genealogy, in the ordinance of circumcision. As disciples of Moses, they have now for thirty-four centuries raised the cry, 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one God;' and every Sabbath day, even to the present time, Moses and the prophets are read in their synagogues, in the same order as when the Apostle St. James mentions the fact, eighteen hundred years ago, as already, in his time, an ancient custom."—p. 2.

The marks and features of their oriental extraction, which, although naturalized for some thousand years in the West, remain unchanged, render them objects of interest to those among whom they dwell. This interest is enhanced by the consideration, that "they have ever been a people of sojourners," found, even long before the fall of Jerusalem, among all the other nations of the East, and since that event, dispersed among all the dwellers upon the face of the earth;

and yet, though assuming something of the character of the people among whom they dwell, preserving a principle of unity, stamping them everywhere most unmistakably as descendants of one family and one father. When to this is added, that "two powerful religions derive, though in a very different manner, their origin from the existence of this people:" that both in the gospel of truth, and the imposture of the Koran, the fathers of Israel are recognized as the fathers of their respective faith: that in both these creeds the prophets of Israel are honored as men of God, and the city of Jerusalem as a holy city, and that, notwithstanding this high antiquity, and the possession of a history full of touching and sublime incidents, Israelite has become a term of reproach, a Jew a contemptuous epithet, both among Mahometans and Christians: when we consider the proofs which they afford of prophecies fulfilled, and the prospects which they have before them in prophecies still to be accomplished, surely we have before us an object marvellous in its singularity, imposing in its historical relations, and absorbingly interesting in all its various aspects." What a theme for anxious contemplation to the whole world, is the people whose history spreads over four thousand out of the whole six thousand years that contain the records of the human race! while even the modern part of it can be traced back during a period of eighteen hundred years!

Were there now in existence, even a single individual who could, with certainty, trace his pedigree from one of the ancient Greek or Roman families, with what care and interest would such a circumstance be investigated, as a living remnant of antiquity! And yet Israel, the *very Israel* whose annals extend to the most remote periods of sacred and profane history, still remains, not as a remnant only, consisting of a few solitary individuals or families, but the whole body of the people still exists, scattered over every part of our globe."—p. 4 sq.

Let us endeavor to present as condensed a view as possible of the ample details, that fill up the animated picture set before us by our author. He is not simply the narrator of facts and events: with philosophic acumen he traces these to their sources, unfolds their connexions, and points out their relations to other historic streams, and to future developments and results. In his portraiture of character, and exhibition of the separate scenes of the great historic drama which he rolls along before our eyes, he displays much poetic genius

and artistic skill, while the whole performance is irradiated by that devoutly christian spirit, which animates all his works.

Every reader of Scripture knows, that it is in Egypt that Israel, no longer only a family of which the individuals can be named in a few minutes, assumes a position of historic importance. Although it would be deeply interesting to present the views and observations of our author upon the varied influences exerted upon the Hebrew nation and the Hebrew mind by the long sojourn in Egypt, or to follow him in his narrative of the many vicissitudes, sufferings and achievements of the Jews, down to the destruction of Jerusalem, and in his brief, but spirited account of the remarkable destinies of the Holy City, since the Roman conquest, especially under the Crusaders, and down to our day, we must pass all this by, and proceed at once to his second book, in which he first examines the Talmuds, the Masorah and Cabbala, and then recounts the history of the Jews in the Eastern Roman empire.

Notwithstanding the entire destruction of Jerusalem, and the complete dispersion of its inhabitants, the Jewish people, though now without metropolis, without temple, without country, yet continued a nation. And the first point to be noted here, is, the means employed by the providence of God, to effect the *national* preservation of Israel, down to the present time.

A most important influence was here exerted by their strict observance of the ceremonial law, and especially of the rite of circumcision. "As disciples of Moses, and children of the prophets and sacred writers, they at all times and in all places carried with them their Scriptures in the original language; handing them down from generation to generation. They tried to make amends to themselves for the loss of their city and temple in various ways, and manifested afresh their remarkable perseverance of character and ingenuity of mind, by the measures they took to form a completely new centre of nationality."—p. 112 sq.

"Directly after the triumph of Titus, the great council of the Israelitish Rabbins was established at Tiberias in Galilee. The school of scribes, instituted in that city, soon took the place of that Temple, whose restoration has never ceased to be the object of their hopes and prayers." Here was produced "the Mishna, and eventually the Talmud; the so called Oral Law reduced to writing, arranged, commented upon and explained; which became, in the course of a few centuries, a

complete Digest, or Encyclopædia of the law, the religion and the nationality of the Jews." It would be deeply interesting to present here the views which our author, himself once a Jew, but writing entirely as an enlightened and devout christian, expresses respecting the Mishna and Gemara, and the judgment which he pronounces upon the monuments of Israel's blindness and hardness of heart; but, as we have a vast field to traverse, we must hasten onward.

With the Talmud, the Masorah and the Cabbala, a triple panoply of tradition, the sons of Israel entered upon the many centuries of their dispersion, and, by its means, preserved their nationality through the time of their deepest humiliation and misery. "The dispersed Jews, even before the fall of Jerusalem, had classed themselves under three designations. The Rabbins understand by the "Captivity of the East," the remains of the ten tribes; by that "of Egypt," the Jews under the dominion of the Ptolemies, particularly those of Alexandria; by that "of the West," the Jews dispersed over every part of the Roman empire."—p. 119. We regard here only a twofold division into Eastern and Western. "Both in the East and West, but especially in Europe, their history records little else than a continuation of misery, humiliation and degeneracy." Yet we must not imagine that the Jews fell at once into this condition. History shows us that the judgment of God upon great cities, condemned on account of their sins, advances upon them slowly and by degrees, till the time of its complete accomplishment. It has been the same with the prophecies against rebellious and unbelieving Israel. Because of their sins, (as they themselves confess at great length in their daily prayers, only omitting the greatest of all sins—their rejection of the Savior) judgment has come upon them gradually, waxing stronger and stronger, and fulfilling more and more exactly to the letter, the prophecies of the Lord."—p. 119 sq.

In the Roman empire, down to the time of Constantine, the Jews were, in general, honored and distinguished, rather than despised or oppressed. Even when the christians were suffering under bloody edicts, the Jews enjoyed favors and privileges. But with the conversion of Rome's emperor to christianity, a complete reverse came over the condition of the Jews. They now became a condemned and persecuted sect; and as the first period of their humiliation begins at this epoch, we find them henceforward visibly sinking into a state of continually progressive oppression and misery. The

gleam of hope which shone upon them in the days of Julian the Apostate, was now quenched, and under his christian successors their condition grew worse and worse. Both in the Eastern and in the Western empire, emperors and bishops visited them with disabilities, oppressions and persecutions. These became so severe under the government of the emperor Justin, and the Code of Justinian, that during the reign of the latter, many rebellions broke out among his Jewish subjects—the dying throes of their national existence; and already in 530, a false Messiah, named Julianus, arose, who was beheaded a year or two after, and his followers dispersed. After a number of other fearful commotions, the Jews were, during and after the reign of Justinian, reduced, in the Greek empire, to a condition in which even the last vestige of political importance was lost. In the far East the Jews continued to enjoy a degree of comparative prosperity, until the triumph of the Koran swept all before it; and in the eleventh century the dignity of Resh-Glutha, which is the proper title of the Patriarch of Babylon, ceased entirely. In Parthia, in Persia, and in the Arabian peninsula, peculiar circumstances and affinities had obtained for the Hebrews many favors and privileges, and in Arabia, even Mohammed smiled for awhile upon them; but as soon as they declared against him, they became the especial objects of his hatred. He called them very hard names, and treated them with great severity. Although after his time the Mussulmans did not again actually persecute the Jews, they have ever since maintained a hostile attitude toward each other. “Popular hatred and contempt has ever been the portion of Israel under the crescent, as well as the cross: as in christian Europe, so in Mahometan Asia and Africa, the Jew was compelled to bear a distinctive mark in his garments—*here* the yellow hat, *there* the black turban.”—p. 138.

Yet it is well known that Muhammed and Saracen Mussulmans, as well as Arabians, esteemed it a high honor to be descended from Abraham, and that the followers of Muhammed regarded the Jewish prophets, including Issah (i. e. Jesus) as holy men, Jerusalem as a holy city, Sinai as a holy mountain, and that “they look upon the valley of Jehoshaphat as the spot where Jesus, the Judge of the nations, with Mahomet at his side, will judge the world, seated upon a stone, which the Mahometan points out to the traveller. But a still closer connexion with the Talmud and the Jewish tra-

ditions, has been of late found to exist in the Koran. It has long been a matter of difficulty to reconcile the undoubted marks of a biblical influence in the composition of the Koran, with its author's palpable ignorance of the real contents of the Bible. The kind of half-knowledge it manifests, both of men and facts in the Old Testament, and of our Savior's life in the New, has been attributed to a supposed intimacy of Mahomet with the historians. New light, however, has been thrown upon the subject, since attention has been drawn to a person who is entitled to a distinguished place in the biography of the founder of Islamism. Warakha Ibn Naufal was nearly related to Kadisha, the first wife of Mahomet.—An Ishmaelite by birth, but disgusted with the idolatry of his nation and contemporaries, he sought for a purer faith,—*first* in the bosom of pharisaical Judaism, and *later*, in the deeply degenerate christianity of the East.

At last he attached himself to Mahomet, and soon obtained considerable influence over the Prophet of Mecca and his doctrines. It is more than probable, that by Warakha Ibn Naufal's acquaintance with the holy writings of both the Jews and Christians, and also with the Rabbinical traditions, many circumstances were brought to the knowledge of Mahomet, which subsequently found their way, with more or less adulteration, into the Koran. At least the Biblical legends of this singular book, are also to be met with in the Talmud and other ancient writings of the Jews. The Koran may be looked upon, in some respects, as a kind of 'military Mishna.'—p. 138 sq.

The following pages communicate much interesting information relative to the Jews who have, since the dispersion, been met with beyond the boundaries of either the old Roman or the Byzantine Empire, both in the most remote parts of the interior of Asia, and upon the coast of Malabar. We have room to notice only the Jewish population, which has long existed in the far-distant regions of China. This colony was first discovered by the Jesuits, in 1642, who met the Jews at Pekin. The careful research of French Savans, particularly of the Orientalist, De Sacy, have led to the following conclusions respecting these Chinese Jews. "Between the time of Ezra and the destruction of the second Temple, Jews from Persia emigrated to China, and established themselves in five of the principal cities of that vast empire. This is confirmed by the fact, that the Chinese Jews are well acquainted with Ezra, whom they regard with almost as much

veneration as Moses, while they appear to be quite ignorant of the pharisaical traditions of the Talmud. Their Persian origin (probably by way of Chorazan and Samarcand) is attested by the mixture of Persian words in their language.—The whole population of the Chinese Jews sprang from seven tribes, or families, whose names * * * * * seem to be derived from those of the different emperors under whom, at successive periods, those families established themselves in China. To the first of these emigrations we certainly cannot assign a later date than the early part of the second century before the birth of Christ.”—p. 144. “They do not pronounce the name of Jehovah, but substitute that of the *Lord*. They have no knowledge whatever of the name or history of our Savior.”—p. 145.

In the Western empire, the condition of the Jews was exceedingly deplorable, after the conversion of the Roman emperors to christianity. The Merovingian line treated them with extreme rigor, and inflicted upon them the most galling disabilities. But “under the dynasty of the Carlovingians in France, we find the Jews of the eighth and ninth centuries enjoying so great a degree of prosperity, that the Romish bishops took alarm, and thought it necessary to enter a protest.” The privileges granted them by Pepin le Bref were greatly multiplied and extended by his illustrious son, Charlemagne, whose enlightened policy exhibited, notwithstanding his zealous devotion to Catholicism, the essential elements of protestantism. His son and successor, Louis le Debonnaire, although narrow-minded and bigoted, continued to treat the Jews with benevolence, and conferred upon them numerous and most important privileges. But a sad change was at hand. “The position of the Jews underwent an entire change at the downfall of the Carlovingian dynasty, which began to decay after the death of Louis le Debonnaire. The invasion of the Normans, who, in the latter years of the reign of Charlemagne, began to overrun Europe, was partly the cause, and partly the signal, for a complete change of the whole state of things in that quarter of the world. The whole surface of affairs in Germany and France, and to a certain extent in Italy and England also, was, (if we may so express it) completely flooded, and its aspect from that time entirely changed. An age of barbarism spread over the whole face of christianity, [christendom?] during which the power of kings, the commercial prosperity of nations, their internal and external means of communication, and, in a word, all general

peace and order were involved in one common ruin. During this age of almost revolutionary anarchy, the feudal system developed itself. This striking characteristic of the middle ages, the sole remedy for so many existing evils, became so firmly established, that its remains still exist, and continue, though with a decreasing power, to exert their influence over the institutions of the present time. To the Jews, this new system was in every way injurious. With the growth of the feudal system in Europe, the rise of the Capetian dynasty in France, and the establishment of the Duke of Normandy on the throne of England, commenced a period of seven centuries, the time of the most cruel oppression and deepest debasement which that unhappy nation ever underwent."—p. 154 sqq.

We cannot pretend to give even a sketch of the animated and deeply interesting narrative which here follows in our author's work. The persecutions and grinding oppression which the Jews were made to suffer during this long and dismal period, necessarily tended to degrade their moral character, which is here fully analyzed, and minutely portrayed.—The Normans were constitutionally and on principle, the enemies and oppressors of the Jews; but while they were distinguished for the exquisitely refined cruelties which they practised upon them, this unhappy people fared little better in other European countries not under the sway of the Normans. Many of these oppressions and cruelties were, undoubtedly, practised in direct violation of existing laws, which, however, were of little avail to the Jew, in the state of public opinion and feeling that prevailed in those ages. And, indeed, "the laws themselves were but little more lenient to the Jew. They excluded him from every dignity which might raise his position, and from every employment which might ameliorate it. The Jews were debarred by law from holding landed property, from exercising any civil or military office, and even from the right of citizenship; while many humiliating obligations were imposed upon them. They were shut up within the narrow bounds of a peculiar quarter, often, as in many towns of Italy, and Rome in particular, locked up at night like cattle in a yard. Open marks of degradation were imposed upon them, such as yellow clothes, peaked hats, and the like. In Bohemia, there was an edict issued, prescribing a peculiar manner of hanging the Jews, in order that a distinction might be made between their body and that of the christian criminal, who might share the same fate."—p. 167 sq.

Admitting that the Jews incurred this lamentable fate, in consequence of their own national sins, and of their obstinate rejection of the Savior and his gospel, this by no means justifies those who visited them with treatment, which was no more in accordance with the spirit of christianity, than it was calculated to win them from their pertinacious adherence to their errors to the reception of the truth and the profession of the gospel. But, whatever secular causes and human agencies may have combinedly operated in the production of these results, nothing is more certain than that these results themselves were foreseen and distinctly foretold twenty-five centuries before, by the great Hebrew prophet and historian, Moses, in that remarkable passage in the book of Deuteronomy (xxviii: 29), here cited by our author: "And the Lord shall scatter thee among all people, from the one end of the earth even unto the other; and there thou shalt serve other gods, which neither thou nor thy fathers have known, even wood and stone. And among these nations shalt thou find no ease, neither shall the sole of thy foot have rest; but the Lord shall give thee there a trembling heart, and failing of eyes, and sorrow of mind; and thy life shall hang in doubt before thee; and thou shalt fear day and night, and shalt have none assurance of thy life; in the morning thou shalt say, would God it were even! and at even thou shalt say, would God it were morning! for the fear of thine heart wherewith thou shalt fear, and for the sight of thine eyes which thou shalt see." (Deut. 28: 64—67.)

Whoever reads any full account of the Jews during the middle ages, or any accurate description of their condition on the European continent in more recent times, cannot fail to be struck with the fact, that they were nowhere recognized as citizens, nowhere regarded as constituting a component part of the body politic: they were looked upon as interlopers, barely to be tolerated, and expected to be thankful for the minimum of the most shabby toleration that could be accorded to them: viewed thus, as intruders, they were treated like some foreign substance that has got into the human body, having no vital connection with its organism, and to be endured or ejected, according to circumstances; according to the caprice of the person into whose system it had intruded, or the degree of inconvenience or trouble of which it might be supposed to be the cause.

Our author, having given a general view of this period, and added a variety of instructive and profitable reflections, pro-

ceeds to particulars, and relates what befell the Jews in the several principal states of christian Europe. This copious and deeply interesting narrative, in which we have not space to follow the eloquent historian, we commend to the particular attention of our readers. It contains not only history, but special accounts of prominent families, and most interesting particulars concerning eminent men, distinguished either for learning or other important merits. In Spain and Portugal the Jews passed through the most striking reverses, enjoying at one time the highest honors, at another subjected indiscriminately to the most virulent and ferocious persecutions, especially at the hands of that ruthless monster, the Inquisition: here flourished their most eminent scholars, among whom was the celebrated Maimonides, of whom a very full account is given: here they most successfully cultivated the sciences, and even distinguished themselves in polite literature; and from here other parts of Europe, besides Africa, received them in great numbers, when the Inquisition, under the savage administration of Torquemada, expelled them from Spain. We quote here the following appropriate observations of our author, in connexion with this matter:

"In the year 1570 the doctrines of the Reformation appear to have been completely crushed in Spain, and the persecutions of the Inquisition again turned against the concealed Jews or Mahometans. This tribunal exerted itself with less success, and apparently with far less zeal, to eradicate infidelity and the teachings of the French philosophers, than it had used in its efforts to crush the protestant faith. And how could it be otherwise? when superstition and infidelity, whether they allow it or not, are so closely allied! The Sadducees and Pharisees *agreed* to crucify our Savior, and to persecute his witnesses and disciples. A warning of deep moment in these our days!

The short-sighted hatred of the Inquisition had rather converted the Judaism of Spain into a festering wound in the body of the nation, than effectually combated or uprooted it. The unity thus obtained was only in externals, while in secret the Jewish religion was propagated with a system of dissimulation which could not but exercise a most pernicious influence on character, and become the source of most revolting blasphemies against God and our Lord Jesus Christ. Unanimous testimony is borne, both by Jewish and Spanish writers, to the fact, that there is scarcely a family of note in Spain or Portugal, which is not descended, either in the male or fe-

male line, from Jews who had embraced christianity by conviction or from other motives.

Is it, then, surprising that the religion their fathers had professed for so many ages, should possess great attractions for their descendants, while placed in the midst of a church whose idolatry and saint-worship the Israelites was as much justified in condemning, as he was wrong in rejecting the suffering Savior, who had been foretold by his own prophets?—When, in addition to this, there sprung from the midst of the Papacy, and flourished in Spain, a sect whose doctrines inculcated ‘mental reserve,’ ‘simulation,’ and ‘hypocrisy,’ in matters of religion, is it wonderful that the Jews of Spain should also have had recourse to rabbinical subtleties to reconcile an outward profession of christianity with an inward love and secret performance of the Mosaic worship? Hence arose the fearful evils which are said yet to exist in Spain, posts of dignity in the church, the priesthood, and the cloister occupied by men who in heart are Jews, and who meet at stated seasons to mourn over and abjure their outward profession of the Romish faith, and to curse, with fearful imprecations, the memory of Ferdinand and Isabella. No! it is ‘not by might nor by power’ that Israel’s conversion will be brought about, ‘but by my Spirit, saith the Lord,’ the God of Israel, his Redeemer.”—p. 362 sqq.

Yes: Israel has indeed been most persistently obstinate in refusing to acknowledge Jesus of Nazareth as the promised Messiah, and in rejecting the covenant of grace set forth and offered to a perishing world, in the gospel. From the history before us, and from the better and more encouraging experiences of more recent days, we are to learn, that nominal christendom is doubtless, to a very great extent—to what extent, it would be most appalling to estimate—accountable for Israel’s obstinate continuance in their bondage to error and superstition. The sword, the rack, the faggot, and a thousand other means of torture and death, are sad and worse than useless instrumentalities for the conviction of the mind, and the conversion of the soul. Had christian governments and those who professed to be ministers of Christ, ever since Constantine’s profession of christianity, approached the Jews in the same spirit and manner in which Christ himself and his apostles labored for their conversion, who may venture to say what might have been the glorious result, not only among the Jews themselves, but through them, among other people? Since christian nations have changed their treatment of the

Jews, a great change has taken place among them as respects their views of christianity, and great numbers have embraced, and continue to embrace the gospel; and, although the policy so long pursued toward them has served to raise their prejudices and superstition to a state of almost inflexible inveteracy, yet we see, in this country and elsewhere, that the total change in their external circumstances and their relations to christian communities and governments, has effected a marvellous change in their views and feelings relative to the christian faith and church. When we consider that they either have obtained, as here, or are obtaining, as in Europe, equal rights and privileges with their christian fellow-citizens; nay, when we regard the prominence which they have attained, of late, in many European countries, in the most important relations, pursuits and interests of the state, may we not hope that, under God's blessing, the enlightened and christian policy thus pursued toward them, will, as it has already measurably done, more and more draw them out of the strongholds and away from the entrenchments of their superannuated and effete faith, to the green pastures and still waters of divine grace in the gospel, and from the bondage of their superstition to the glorious liberty of the children of God?

Our author's history of the Jews in Spain and Portugal, is a narrative of profound, often most painfully thrilling interest: scarcely less interesting is the account of their experiences and fates in the countries to which, when expelled from the peninsula, they fled, or which their brethren had inhabited for centuries. The author's account of "The Jews and the Reformation:" of Sabbathai Sevi, their false Messiah in the East: of the Jews in Italy, Hungary, Russia and Poland; of the Sabbathaism derived from the false Messiah before mentioned: of a number of Jews, who have, of late years, acquired high distinction in Germany and elsewhere, and of other kindred subjects, will be found replete with most important and valuable information. The dimensions to which this article has grown make it necessary that we should defer the communication promised at the beginning, of a variety of matters connected with the modern history of the Jews, to some future day. Meanwhile we again commend to our readers the valuable work before us: it is rich in varied and most interesting instruction: the production of a master-pen, it is written in a most attractive and fascinating style, tolerably well rendered in the English translation: none can rise from its perusal without deriving from it the most substantial profit and profound delight.

ARTICLE III.

REMINISCENCES OF LUTHERAN CLERGYMEN.

XXX.

FREDERICK WILLIAM GEISSENHAINER, D. D.

As we plant the cypress over the graves that we would not have forgotten, and rear a monument to the memory of our illustrious dead, we must not omit the name of this eminent Divine, so distinguished for his talents and acquirements, and who, during life, occupied a prominent position in the ministry of the Lutheran church in America.

Frederick William Geissenhainer was the son of Henry Athanasius and Sophia Henrietta Geissenhainer, and was born at Mülheim on the Ruhr, Dukedom of Bergen, now belonging to the kingdom of Prussia, the 26th of June, 1771. Death deprived him of his father, who was a merchant, and in good circumstances, when he was only three years of age. Fortunately for him, however, he was blessed with a pious mother, and a deep interest was taken in his welfare by his grandfather, Rev. Dr. Geissenhainer, who was regarded as one of the most learned and pious Theologians of the day. He furnished him with the means for obtaining an education, and superintended his studies. Early destined for the church, the best advantages were afforded the child for mental improvement. It happened that, just about this time, the last Monks of a Catholic cloister, in that region, died, and his grandfather was appointed by the Duke of Bergen, to establish in its place, an institution in which might be taught the various branches of an Academic course. Although a rigid Lutheran, Dr. Geissenhainer selected Catholics exclusively, as instructors for the school, influenced by a sense of justice towards those to whom the property had formerly belonged, and by the fact that the best teachers of that day were to be found in the Catholic church. The grandchild entered this Seminary before he was eight years of age, and as the Latin was the language commonly spoken by the Professors, and the medium of all the instruction, he soon became more fa-

miliar with it than with his vernacular tongue. In a short time he gave evidence of great intellectual precocity, and a wonderful facility in acquiring knowledge. His youth was marked as one of great power and promise, and at the age of thirteen, he had finished the prescribed course. With the design of pursuing the study of Theology, he now enters the University of Giessen, where he remained for three years. Having completed the regular curriculum, but being only sixteen years of age, and therefore too young to assume the active duties of the ministry, he became a member of the University of Göttingen, where he continued two years in the further prosecution of his theological studies. In the meantime, his grandfather having died, and being still too young to take charge of a congregation, he returned to Giessen, and became Professor Extraordinary, in anticipation of a regular appointment as Professor, a course often adopted by young men possessing talent and means, in connexion with the German Universities. He soon, however, received a call as Professor of Languages in some Institution, which he accepted, and in this situation he was engaged for two years, still adding to his stores of knowledge. When he reached his twentieth year, in compliance with the wishes and advice of his friends, he applied for ministerial ordination, which, although usually withheld from all under twenty-five years of age, was granted to him, as an honorable exception to the general rule, on account of his superior qualifications for the sacred office.

Immediately after his ordination, the youthful pastor took charge of two village congregations, to whom he ministered for the space of eighteen months. During his occupancy of this position, he received an invitation to Rotterdam, where he was expected to officiate in the Dutch language, a knowledge of which he had, in a very short time, acquired, but as the situation did not suit him, he rejected the call. Whilst on the visit to Holland, a Missionary Society proposed to send him as a missionary to this country. This offer he also declined, preferring to remain in the field of labor which he then occupied. This connexion was, however, soon after terminated, in consequence of the political convulsions which were then agitating his native land. These were troublous times. The French Revolution was diffusing consternation and distress, and the country was visited with all the dangers and calamities of war. In the midst of the excitement, he received the sad information of the death and burial of his beloved mother, intelligence of which had been delayed by

the difficulty of communication, in consequence of the disturbances that existed. About this time, an only brother paid him a visit, and as there was no particular tie of affection now to bind them to their country, they resolved to transfer their residence to this Western hemisphere, whither the tide of immigration was taking its way, and which presented so wide a field of usefulness. Here they supposed they would find exemption from many of the evils to which they were exposed, and enjoy peace and happiness.

They accordingly took their departure from their native land, without even visiting their old home, and leaving, as they imagined, whatever patrimony was coming to them, to their only surviving relative, a maiden aunt, who had dwelt under the same roof with their mother. They reached Philadelphia in the Summer of 1793, under most unpropitious circumstances. The yellow fever had just broken out, and the citizens who were able, had fled from the scene of pestilence. The brothers, too, fell among thieves at the public house at which they had stopped, whilst the landlord tried to alarm the fears of the young preacher, by telling him how much ill-treatment clergymen were accustomed to suffer in this land, and that it was a common thing, particularly in the rural districts, for the people to beat them, if their sermons did not satisfy their prejudices, or please their vitiated taste. It is not surprising that, in a strange country, with little experience of the world, of a delicate constitution and slender stature, the subject of our sketch was easily frightened, and resolved to return in the first vessel that sailed for Europe. In the meantime, however, he went with his brother to Wilmington, leaving his trunks and many of his effects, at the hotel in Philadelphia, in charge of the keeper. But when the fever had subsided, and they returned to the city with the view of making their arrangements, preparatory to sailing, they found that their trunks had been broken open, and their money and most of their articles abstracted, the landlord professing profound ignorance on the subject. More than ever they now desired to hasten away from a land in which they had already encountered so much to discourage them. But Mr. Geissenhainer concluded that, before he left, he must visit the Lutheran ministers living in Philadelphia. Calling therefore, upon the Rev. Dr. Helmuth, as soon as the Doctor heard his name, he said, "Why did you not call before? An invitation from congregations has been lying here for you these three months." He replied, "I am aware of the fact, and on that account

have studiously avoided you, as I intend to return at once to Germany." The Doctor urged him to remain, begging him at the same time, to explain the reasons of his strange resolution. When he learned how his fears had been excited by the cruel landlord, he tried to assure him that imposition had been practised upon his credulity, and that ministers did not suffer in the way he apprehended. But it was all in vain. His mind was made up, and he could not be dissuaded from his intention. He however consented, as a favor, before his departure, to fill an appointment at Barren-Hill for Rev. Dr. Schaeffer, who was at the time pastor of the Lutheran congregation at Germantown, Pa., and the vicinity. He rode out on horseback, but all the time was very much depressed in spirit, and when he reached the place, he tied his horse fast, and stood for a considerable time at some distance off from the church, as if afraid to venture in. The congregation waited for a whole hour, expecting the minister every minute to enter, but at length growing impatient, one of the elders approached the stranger, a small and timid looking man, who was not recognized as a clergyman, perhaps from his youth, and his having on a light colored overcoat, as the day was cool, which he had worn on board the ship. On the elder making inquiry whether he knew of any minister who was coming on that Sabbath from Germantown to preach for them, Mr. Geissenhainer summoned up courage to say, that he had come for that purpose. On which he was conducted to the church, but as soon as the services were concluded, he hurried off as fast as he could, in dread of the beating, which he thought would be inflicted. Being a good rider, he quickened his pace, but how great his alarm, when suddenly looking back, he saw some one coming towards him at a most rapid rate! And now the race began. The man called upon him to stop, but the more he called, the faster the preacher urged on his steed. The elder at last overtook him, and now the clergyman was filled with trepidation, as he felt there would certainly be no escape, and that he would have to submit to the castigation which he had so much dreaded. His fears were, however, somewhat dissipated, by the gentle and kind words of the elder, who requested him to accompany him to his home and dine with him. He said that he wished to converse with him on a matter of conscience, as he was convinced from the sermon, that he could give him the best advice. But regarding this as only a cunning device to get him into his power, he declined the invitation, and hastened on to Phila-

delphia. On relating to Dr. Helmuth these circumstances, the Doctor told him he ought, by all means, to have gone with the elder, and also tried to deliver his young friend from the false and painful misrepresentations under which his mind was laboring. He finally succeeded so far, that Mr. Geissenhainer decided he would accept the call to the congregations tendered him in Montgomery County, about forty miles from Philadelphia, and for a season, at least, make trial of the ministry in this country. An incident, however, occurred at the very beginning of his experience, that almost made him regret the step he had taken, and served to confirm him in the opinion he had conceived with regard to the rudeness of the country people. On his arrival at Goschenhoppen, he put up at an inn, and on the following Sabbath preached his first sermon. After the services, the vestry met and decided that, as it was improper for the pastor to remain at a public house, one of their own number must take him into his family. But so profound a reverence for the youthful preacher was entertained, that all made objection to his reception. Finally two, who lived on fine farms, and possessed ample accommodations, were selected, one of whom, it was said, must consent to the arrangement. Both still expressing very great aversion to the proposition, they resolved to cast lots for the purpose of ascertaining upon whom the necessity should be laid. Mr. Geissenhainer had been all the time a silent spectator to the discussion, but now he could no longer restrain his feelings and keep silence. He told them that he did not wish to obtrude upon any man's hospitalities—that under the circumstances, he could not remain, and that he would at once return to Philadelphia. His host of the inn, a christian-minded man, who was present, now interfered and asserted, that there was not a member of the Board who would not most cheerfully receive him into his family, and consider himself highly honored to have the minister dwell under his roof, but they all feared that the accommodations they could furnish, would not be good enough for such a man as he was. This explanation presented the case in quite a different aspect, and the preacher assuring them that on that point there need be no difficulty, Mr. Michael Reiter offered to give him a home in his family.

Mr. Geissenhainer soon found that the churches to which he had been called, were in a very distracted condition. As in other places, unprincipled men, wearing the garb of religion, and preaching without any authority, had thrust themselves upon the congregations, and done immense mischief,

in sowing seeds of discord, and producing a feeling of distrust in reference to all clergymen. There was a general indifference on the subject of piety, and immorality was greatly on the increase. A change was, however, very soon effected under the administration of Mr. Geissenhainer. The churches were revived. A deep interest was awakened in divine truth, and a fresh impulse given to the cause of religion. Peace and harmony were restored among the members, and the congregations flourished as they had never before. The youthful minister exercised an unlimited influence, not only among the people of his own charge, but in other parts of the church. His fame as a pulpit orator, and as a devoted servant of Christ, spread far and wide, and very soon he was regarded as one of the very first Divines in the Lutheran church in this country. As we had no Theological Seminary at that day, he was one of the few clergymen, appointed by Synod, to prepare young men for the christian ministry. Many availed themselves of the opportunity offered, and among the number were some of our most influential and useful pastors. His brother Henry, who immigrated with him to this country, and who had already commenced his studies in the fatherland, was one of his first pupils.*

The subject of our sketch, in the year 1794, entered into a matrimonial alliance with Anna Maria Reiter,† with whom he continued to live in uninterrupted harmony, until death closed the relation. From this union there were six children, two of whom still survive, Rev. F. W. Geissenhainer, of N. York city, and Anna Maria, the widow of Jacob Miller, D. D., for many years pastor of Trinity Church, Reading, Pa.

After a residence of some years at Goschenhoppen, Mr. Geissenhainer removed to New Hanover township, and in connexion with his other congregations, took charge of what is known as the Swamp church, one of the Collegiate churches, to which the venerable Muhlenberg had ministered. In that day the scarcity of ministers was so great as to render it necessary for one man to attend to as many congregations as lay in his power. It was not the best arrangement for our

* Rev. Henry Geissenhainer was settled for a time at the Trappe, whence he removed to Pittsburg, but in the year 1821, whilst on a visit to his son at the Trappe, he took sick and died. His remains repose in the cemetery connected with the old church, in which several of our earlier ministers lie buried.

† An older sister was married to Rev. Mr. Ræller, a worthy minister of the Lutheran church.

people, and yet how much better than that they should receive no attention at all, and altogether famish for want of spiritual food. Whilst in this field, Mr. Geissenhainer's influence increased and his labors multiplied. New congregations around him were formed, and there was a constant demand for his services. His preaching was everywhere popular. Even a congregation of Mennonites, whose elders preach, without any remuneration, made application to him to become their regular pastor. He replied, "Your preachers receive no salary, and I am paid for my services." To which they said, "We know this, but there is a vast difference between your preaching and theirs. We will pay you a good salary, if you will only consent to serve us." "But how will your elders," said he, "like your proposition?" To this they answered, "We are ourselves the elders, and we have come to make the contract with you." When they learned that he had no part of the Lord's day unoccupied, on which he could officiate, they besought him to preach to them on Saturday afternoon. But even this he could not promise, for in several churches he was in the habit of preaching every Saturday.

From the commencement of his labors in this country, Mr. Geissenhainer manifested a deep concern, not only for the religious advancement of his charge, but for their intellectual and social improvement. He established in their midst more efficient schools, and sought to eradicate many superstitious notions that prevailed, and to remove the strong prejudices existing against the English language. He also introduced useful inventions, and did much to improve agriculture and the mechanical arts among them. He also founded a public library, and imported from Europe many excellent books, religious and scientific. He himself served as the librarian, and it was his practice to select for the members, such works as he deemed most profitable to them, and when they returned the books, to converse with them on what they had read. So great a desire for reading and self-improvement was thus formed among these plain persons, as it was before supposed they were incapable of attaining. It is not surprising that such a man should be held in high estimation, and his influence be extended throughout the whole region of country. So high was his reputation, that individuals, from a feeling of curiosity, would come from remote points to visit him. On a certain occasion, an elderly gentleman from a great distance, called and inquired for old Mr. Geissenhainer, supposing that a man so distinguished for wisdom, and possessing so much

influence, must necessarily be advanced in life. When the young minister presented himself, appearing even more youthful than he really was, the stranger surveyed him from head to foot, and said, "I wish to see your father!" "My father," he replied, "died many years ago in Europe." "Then," said the gentleman, "I have been misdirected. Is there any other clergyman in these parts by the name of Geissenhainer? for I have come a considerable distance to see that renowned old pastor, and to converse with him on the subject of religion." The preacher said, "They call me old pastor Geissenhainer, inasmuch as I have a younger brother than myself in the ministry." The stranger still seemed incredulous. He thought that this could scarcely be the man he sought. But he remarked, "As I have come so far, I may as well communicate my difficulties, and freely unbosom to you my mind." After talking with him for more than half a day, apparently much delighted, and fully satisfied, he took his hat to depart, exclaiming as he went, "I now believe, sir, that you are old Mr. Geissenhainer!"

With all his influence, Mr. Geissenhainer, whilst laboring in this region, had great difficulty in overcoming the general belief in witchcraft. These popular notions, received in childhood, had strengthened with their growth, and it seemed almost impossible to dispel them. Early impressions are not easily eradicated.

*Quo semel est imbuta recens, servabit odorem
Testa diu.*

Observing the deleterious, and often fatal effects of the delusion, he felt that it was his duty to direct his energies, in the pulpit and out of it, to the removal of these superstitious errors. He, however, found a most strenuous opponent to his efforts, in a notorious impostor, who feigned that he possessed the power of exorcism. As he derived no small gain from his craft, he regarded Mr. Geissenhainer with little favor, and put forth the most active exertions to counteract his influence. Fortunately a most trifling circumstance exposed the ridiculous pretensions of the fellow, turned the current of sentiment against him, and arrested the evil, accomplishing that which argument had failed to secure. It happened that one Sabbath evening Mr. Geissenhainer, in passing from one church to another, was obliged to go through a thick dismal woods, for a distance of three miles. It was already quite dark, and, as he was not able to

see the road, he let his faithful white horse pick out the way as well as he could. Content to ride leisurely along, he kindled his German Meerschaum, and thus, in his gloomy solitude, resolved to indulge in his wonted luxury. When he had reached the middle of the thicket, he heard a human sound, which saluted him with "Good evening!" Not being able to discern any one, he felt that he was not recognized, yet he at once detected the voice of the magician, who had been the terror of the whole neighborhood. The idea immediately occurred to him, that he would ascertain whether the breast of the man, who had made others his victims, was himself entirely free from the influence of superstition. He therefore determined to keep perfectly silent, and when the salutation was uttered the second time, he blew the sparks of his tobacco pipe through the holes of the lid. This so alarmed the pretended enchanter, that he at once took to his heels and ran as if for his life, a mile and a half, to the first house, which he reached pale and trembling. At first he was unable to speak, but, after a little, recovering from his fright, and being asked the cause, he answered that he had just encountered in the centre of the dreaded woods, a most frightful ghost—a white horse without a head, and upon it a spirit with a head of fire. Soon after the man had departed, the young clergyman leisurely approached the house—it was the house of one of his deacons, who expressed his surprise that he would venture out alone on so dark a night, and along so dreary a road. The clergyman asked why he should be afraid? "Because," said the deacon, "the wood is haunted. The exorcist, this very evening, escaped from a most formidable apparition, and came hither a few minutes ago, almost frightened to death." "What was it?" inquired the clergyman. The deacon answered, "It was a white horse without a head, and a spirit rider, with a fiery head!" "Why, sir, that apparition was I and my Whitey," said Mr. Geissenhainer, and he told how he had purposely frightened the impostor. The family enjoyed the joke, and on relating the ludicrous story to others, it soon spread through the community, so that the poor fellow's gain was now at an end, and feeling very much mortified with what had occurred, he went to other parts, and after this there was little more heard of witchcraft.

In the year 1804, during a trip which the subject of our sketch made, for the resuscitation of his health, to the North, in company with his brother, an incident occurred, which,

whilst it was grateful to his own feelings, is also an illustration of the eagerness with which the destitute brethren of our faith sought to have the word and the ordinances administered to them. He had reached a settlement almost exclusively composed of Germans, and on stopping at the inn, great was his surprise to find that the hostess had been a former member of his congregation, who begged him to stay over Sabbath and to baptize her child. "For," said she, "we have no sanctuary, no public services, no opportunity to attend the ordinances in these parts." She urged him to preach for them, and proposed to invite the neighbors to come together for worship. Mr. Geissenhainer acceded to her request, and the next day a large number of attentive hearers assembled to hear the truth, and after service the rite of Baptism was administered to eleven children. They then consulted with him as to the best plan to be pursued, in order to secure the regular ministrations of the Gospel! During the course of the conversation, some one inquired, if they had come in that direction to purchase land, as this was the usual errand of strangers, and the land was extremely beautiful and fertile. Mr. Geissenhainer replied that it was not; he was travelling merely for the benefit of his health. There being, however, a very fine farm in sight, he asked what price, land like that brought? The owner, who was present, replied, "If you will purchase the farm and move upon it, I will let you have it at half its value, although I have no desire to part with it."—Several of the company then withdrew and, after some consultation, returned and offered to make him a present of the farm, promising him a regular salary in addition, if he would only become their pastor.

Some years after his arrival in this country, Mr. Geissenhainer, during a visit to Philadelphia, incidentally learned that there had been a mistake in the intelligence communicated to him, whilst yet in Europe, in reference to the death of his mother—that she still lived, but that her sister had, at that time, deceased. On the reception of this gratifying report, he at once made arrangements to have his beloved parent brought to this country. She arrived in 1807, at the advanced age of sixty-four years. In the family of her son, surrounded by every comfort, her life was protracted to its seventy-third year, when, as the record says, "she quietly fell asleep in Jesus."

In the year 1808, Mr. Geissenhainer reluctantly relinquished the charge in which he had pleasantly and successfully

labored for fifteen years, and accepted an importunate call from the associated German Lutheran churches in the city of New York, as successor to the lamented Rev. Dr. Kunze. At this period, the German population in this city was small, and the Lutheran church did not exceed five hundred members. Comparatively few accessions were made to the church, to fill up the ranks occasioned by death and removals; immigration was limited, and the young were disposed, in consequence of the prevalence of the English, and the want of acquaintance with the German, to unite with other denominations. It was evident, that if such a state of things continued, and no provision were made for the introduction of the English into the services of the sanctuary, our church must necessarily become extinct. In the year 1814, Mr. Geissenhainer, therefore, without any regard to his personal convenience or interest, determined to make the effort to have English preaching introduced every Sabbath afternoon, in order that the children, if possible, might be retained in the church of their fathers. The arrangement, as he expected, met with opposition. It was regarded as an innovation upon the rights of the Germans, although from the beginning, occasionally, English services had been performed in the same church. As his motives were misapprehended, and some alienation excited, he regarded it advisable to resign his connexion with the church, and recommended as his successor, Rev. Christian F. Schaeffer, of Harrisburg, Pa., who, coming as a stranger, he thought might be able to adjust the difficulties, and reconcile the conflicting interests.

About this time Mr. Geissenhainer's health was much impaired. He had passed through severe domestic affliction, in the sickness and death of several of his children. He was a tender father, and these trials deeply affected him. He therefore proposed for a season to suspend his ministerial labors, and devote himself to the resuscitation of his physical strength. He repaired to Clearfield County, Pa., where he had some property. Although with no pastoral charge, he frequently preached, without any remuneration for his services, and sought to do good whenever the occasion offered. Whilst residing in this region he enjoyed excellent opportunities for giving attention to the study of the Natural Sciences, to which he had, from early life, been devoted. Mineralogy was his favorite pursuit, and often did he delight in making excursions, in search of specimens. His interest in this branch of science continued until his last days, and it is said he was one

of the first mineralogists, at that time, in the country. He was fond of Chemistry, Mechanics, and kindred subjects, and was the author of many important discoveries and inventions—among them the smelting of iron ore with anthracite coal, the making of steel of all qualities from the same pig metal or bar iron, and the rendering of cut-nails as pliable as wrought-nails, although the credit which he deserved, was never awarded him. He did not derive any pecuniary advantage from these services, but was frequently subjected to annoyances, and encountered many losses in his experiments.

After remaining a few years in Clearfield, he removed to Chester County, where his son resided, but his health having very much improved, he was induced to resume the pastoral office. In 1819 he accepted a call to the congregations at Pottstown, Trappe, etc., and about the year 1820, he established a Sabbath School in the church at Vincent, the first one known in that region, which met with much favor and success.

In the year 1822 he received an invitation to return to his former position in the city of New York, the English portion of the congregation having withdrawn to St. Matthew's church, which had been erected exclusively for English services, and elected Rev. Dr. Schaeffer as their pastor. Although he was called to pass through many difficulties and trials, he continued his ministrations here as long as his physical ability permitted. His last sermon he preached on Easter Sunday, March 26th, 1837. He also, on the same occasion, administered the Lord's Supper to a large number of communicants. The protracted services, however, proved too much for his strength. A long and serious illness succeeded, from which, although he partially recovered so as to be able to attend to the lighter duties of his office, yet he was never again sufficiently restored to perform pulpit labor. On the following Christmas he met his beloved flock, and once more dispensed the Sacrament, yet he did not venture to preach. This was his last public work. His strength was gradually declining, and his body becoming more infirm. The powers of his mind were, however, unimpaired, and retained their usual vigor and natural vivacity. He knew that death was approaching, but he manifested the utmost tranquility. There was an entire resignation to his Master's will, and a willingness to obey the summons, at whatever hour he might be required to depart. He realized that God was calling him, and he was ready to go, submissively and cheerfully home. Not

a feeling of dismay seemed to disturb the calm serenity of his spirit.

"Tis a vile thing to die,
When men are unprepared and look not for it!"

But death was to him a familiar subject, one on which he had long and prayerfully reflected, and he could descend to the dark portal of the grave without any tremulous shudder. He spoke freely of his departure, with the most blessed assurance in the boundless mercy of his Heavenly Father, through Jesus Christ our Savior. To the Rev. Joseph Harrison, a Congregational minister, with whom he had long been on terms of intimacy, a few days before his death, he said: "I shall not die! The christian never dies, he only lays off the old garment, to receive a new one. This body is worn out, but the Lord will give me a new one, that I may be active and useful again." "During life," he remarked, "I put my trust in the Lord, and he never forsook me." On Sabbath morning, when dissolution seemed to be near, his son, who was to fill an appointment, inquired, as the hour approached for the service, "Father, shall I stay with you, or go to church?" Warmly clasping his hand, and looking him steadily in the face, he said in his usual loud voice, "Go, son, in God's name, and perform your duties!" To his wife, who stood weeping by his side, he said: "Wife, do you think that I have lived so long in the world, and do not know what death is? Weep not! In a little while it will all be over. I have been with you a long time, and have a larger family in heaven than on earth; I must now go to them. Oh what must it be to meet in the world above!" In expectation of so soon seeing his Savior and his beloved ones, he seemed filled with the greatest joy. Only fifteen minutes before he ceased to breathe, he addressed pious counsels to those around him, and admonished a member of his congregation to continue faithful to the Redeemer. After speaking to him most affectionately, he stretched forth his hand, and said, "Farewell, on earth we shall shake hands no more, but in heaven we shall meet again!" His dying testimony to the value of the truths he had so early professed and so long proclaimed, was most unequivocal and satisfactory. His death occurred on the 27th of May, 1838, on the anniversary of his marriage, just forty-four years before, in the sixty-seventh year of his age, and in the forty-seventh of his ministry. His remains were carried to their resting place amid sorrowing friends, who wept that they should see his face no more, and deposited

in the cemetery of the church over which he had so long presided.* The services on the occasion were performed by Rev. Dr. Wackerhagen, at the time President of the New York Ministerium, Rev. Dr. Strobel and Rev. Joseph Harrison, of the Congregational church. On the succeeding Sabbath, discourses appropriate to the occasion, were delivered in German and English, by Rev. Dr. Wackerhagen and Rev. J. Harrison, the former from the text, "I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live. And whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die. Believest thou this?"—and the latter from the words of the Psalmist, "Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil, for thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff, they comfort me." The church, of which the deceased had for so many years been pastor, was deeply enshrouded in the habiliments of mourning, for the purpose of expressing the sincere grief which the members felt on account of their painful bereavement, whilst the President of the New York Ministerium, at the next convention of Synod, in his official address, on referring to the loss which the church had sustained by the death of Dr. Geissenhainer, declared, "That his deep and extensive learning, his great urbanity, and various other merits, could not but cause his memory to be cherished by all who were acquainted with his character and worth."

Dr. Geissenhainer enjoyed the reputation of being a very able Divine. In the language once applied to a distinguished Roman—*Animo vidit, ingenio complexus est, eloquentia illuminavit*. He possessed an intellect of the highest order, which had been brought under the influence of the most thorough discipline. His mind was strong, logical, well balanced and inquiring, his taste refined and cultivated, his attainments varied and extensive. He had gathered together a vast fund of classical and scientific knowledge, to which he was constantly making additions. He was an admirable linguist. The Latin and Greek seemed as familiar to him as his native tongue. He was skilled in the various departments of human learning. He was fond of study. He loved to seek for the hidden treasures of truth, and from his accumulated information, he would always advance some ideas to throw light upon

* They have since been removed by his son, Rev. F. W. Geissenhainer, to the family vault in the Lutheran Cemetery, near Middle Village, Long Island, where they rest in the midst of those, to whose spiritual wants in life, he so long ministered.

any topic that was suggested. From early life until the year before his death, it was his practice to devote his evenings, often beyond the hour of midnight, to reading, and with a mind so active and so well disciplined as his, valuable results might naturally be expected. He could not be other than a man of varied and extensive erudition. From the University of Pennsylvania he received the degree of Doctor of Divinity, at its annual commencement in 1826. Although a man of much learning, he published very little. He delivered to his students a course of lectures on Church History, in Latin, in order to familiarize them with that language, and also, in German, Exegetical Expositions of portions of the Old Testament, some of the Gospels, and most of the Epistles, which are said to have been very able; these, together with other valuable manuscripts, now in the hands of surviving relatives, we hope will yet be given to the church as its legacy. He had some acquaintance with music, and his poetical talent was considerable. He composed a number of hymns for festival occasions, one of which is still extensively used in the church, adapted to confirmation seasons, beginning thus:

"Fühlt das heiligste Entzücken."

He was very fond of the good old congregational singing, in which all participated. He had a strong dislike to choirs, and that artistic style of music which has become so fashionable of late, particularly in our city churches. He thought its tendency was to banish all devotional singing from the exercises. He always reverently united in these services, regarding them as a part of the worship in which it was the duty of all to take part. He invariably seated himself, during the singing, with the congregation, that he might with them unite in the praises of God.

Dr. Geissenhainer also possessed an extensive acquaintance with medicine, which he had acquired whilst at the University, and to which, in his native land, all students of Theology were obliged to attend. Doctor Hosack used to say of him, that his knowledge of this science was superior to more than one-half of the physicians in the city of New York. This knowledge he found very useful to him in his visitations to the sick, and when all hope of the patient's recovery had been abandoned, his prescriptions were successful, and the man, who seemed on the threshold of the grave, was often restored to health. Many such instances occurred in his experience.

He also had a profound acquaintance with human nature, and could almost intuitively see into character. In his intercourse with others, there was often the "word fitly spoken," which proved "like apples of gold in pictures of silver." So also in preaching, when he apparently "drew a bow at a venture," it "smote between the joints of the harness." Frequently circumstances were so minutely described, and the sinner's actions so accurately depicted, that the impression prevailed that information had been communicated to the preacher in reference to what had occurred. We recollect hearing, that on a certain occasion, when preaching at the Swamp church, he spoke of the prevalence of immorality, the causes, and the responsibility of those who were in any way participants. In the course of the discussion, he gave a very graphic description of what was, in that day, termed a "frolic," and the destructive influence of such scenes upon the young. It happened that there had been, just the evening preceding, one of these gatherings, at the tavern in the neighborhood, although Mr. Geissenhainer was not aware of the fact, and the landlord, a member of the church, who was the next day in attendance at the sanctuary, supposed that the whole discourse was aimed at him. So conscience-stricken was he, and overpowered by the force of the truth, that he first turned red and then white, and afterwards actually crept beneath the seat of the pew, that he might be concealed from the public gaze. He seemed so satisfied at the time, that the account of the previous night's irregularities had been derived from personal knowledge, that he charged one of Mr. Geissenhainer's students with being present and reporting the facts.

As a preacher, Dr. Geissenhainer was evangelical and eloquent. He did not write out his sermons, but preached from a full skeleton, carefully studied. It is said that as he advanced in years, he became much more impressive in the pulpit. His sermons were plain and practical. Divine truth he presented with great clearness and force. His grand aim was the inculcation of the great doctrines and lessons taught in the word of God. His veneration for the Scriptures was most profound, and to their habitual and faithful study he devoted much attention. He was a diligent reader of the sacred volume in the original languages, and his preaching may be said to have been eminently Biblical. The spiritual wants of his hearers he kept constantly in view. He always thought that he could never do too much for his people in the service

of God. Wherever suffering was to be relieved, want supplied, consolation administered or instruction imparted, he was always prepared to afford assistance and bestow his efforts. Many were the beneficiaries of his kindness, and the recipients of his favors.

In his religious belief, Dr. Geissenhainer was thoroughly orthodox. He revered the standards of the church, and without any reserved qualification, cordially adopted them. He retained his attachment to the symbols till the end of life. Yet we never heard that he was illiberal or intolerant in his views, or proscriptive towards those who differed from him in sentiment. He was on the most intimate terms with those who entertained opposite opinions. Although he had no sympathy with what are termed Calvinistic doctrines, yet he cherished so high a regard for many distinguished Divines of the Calvinistic faith, that the walls of his study were adorned with their portraits. On a certain occasion, when Drs. Schmucker, Sr., and Krauth were partaking of his hospitalities, some reference was made to these portraits, and Dr. Schmucker remarked, "Ah sir, you must be a *Crypto-Calvinist*!" "So *Crypto*," he replied, "that I have not yet been able myself to make the discovery." This incident, whilst it shows his position on a question which has excited great difference of opinion, is also an illustration of his respect for those who entertained sentiments different from his own.

Dr. Geissenhainer was, at the time of his death, Senior of the New York Ministerium. He was also a member of the Convention which met in 1820, to organize the General Synod of our church, and preached a sermon on the occasion, which is still remembered as a masterly effort. He was treated with great consideration by his brethren, and a high estimate placed upon his character.

In his personal appearance, Dr. Geissenhainer was very youthful, particularly in the early part of his life, small in stature, about five feet and a half, of slender form and well proportioned. He had a fine head, with an expansive forehead, a frank, open countenance, a large, mild blue eye, a keen sight, and could, at great distances, see objects unobserved by others. His vision became partially impaired when he was about fifty years of age. It returned, however, before his death. His face was sallow, and somewhat pitted with small-pox marks. His hair brown and thin, his teeth

remarkably good, and showed no evidence of decay until the last year of his life, when he suffered for the first time from the effects of tooth-ache. His walk was quick and graceful. In his latter years his appearance was considerably changed. His color became more sallow, his hair thinner, and entirely white. His visage was care-worn, and indicated that of an individual twenty years older.

Dr. Geissenhainer was a man of affectionate disposition and tender heart. In speaking of the subject of religion, he was often deeply affected, and the tears would profusely trickle down his cheeks. To his family he was most warily attached, and separation, even for a few days, was a great trial to him. Frequently, when he had said "Farewell," and gone some distance, overcome by his feelings, he would turn back and remain another day, as if he felt that it might be the last privilege he would enjoy, of being with those whom he, so much loved. In his social relations he was affable, courteous and dignified. He was an intelligent, agreeable, and cheerful companion. He often remarked that the christian had the best right to be cheerful, that he ought to be the happiest of all men, having so good and so mighty a Father in Heaven, and prospects so glorious of a blissful hereafter, through faith in the Redeemer. He would also say, that he would not remain in the society of those, from whom he could not, with pleasure and confidence, turn his thoughts to his Heavenly Parent, and feel assured that his course and conversation would meet the Divine approbation. His dwelling was the abode of hospitality and kindness. His conversation was marked by pleasantry and good humor, and abounded with general information and apt illustration. Yet, in the language of one of the young men whose privilege it was, for several years, to enjoy his instructions, and to be brought into intimate intercourse with him: "He never lost sight of the great end of life, and daily spent some time, communing with his God." His useful life and happy death, is another evidence of the Father's faithfulness to his children. "Say ye to the righteous, that it shall be well with him!"

"In every state secure,
Kept by Jehovah's eye,
'Tis well with them while life endures,
And well when call'd to die."

"Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man the things which God hath prepared for them that love him." "The Lamb which is in the midst of

the throne shall feed them, and shall lead them unto living fountains of water; and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes."

XXXI.

JOHN DANIEL KURTZ, D. D.

To the roll of deceased Lutheran ministers is also added the venerable name of him who, for so many years, formed a connecting link between the ministry of the past and the present generation in our church. The aged patriarch, on the 30th of June, 1856, entered upon his rest, exchanging the toils and sufferings, incident to this life, for the rewards and glories of the eternal world. He died in the ninety-third year of his age, loved and honored by all who knew him. For nearly a half century he ministered to the same church, and had secured the attachment of a large congregation, as well as the regard of the community in which he lived. In every relation, public and private, which he sustained, he was most exemplary, and left no room to doubt his sincerity or piety. The language of his fellow citizens, on the occasion of his death, was, "That no man in Baltimore ever spent sixty years so blamelessly as he," whilst the brethren, with whom he had long been ecclesiastically associated, in convention assembled, with united voice exclaimed, "Help Lord, for the godly man ceaseth, for the faithful fall from among the children of men!" Everywhere he inspired confidence and love, and produced so decided an impression on the minds of those who came within the circle of his influence, that none will ever forget him in the happy combination of qualities which attracted him to all hearts. We met him for the last time, in the Spring of 1855. Being on a visit to the city, which had so long been the scene of his active labors, we gladly availed ourselves of the opportunity afforded, to look once more upon his countenance, ere his gentle spirit passed away. He kindly welcomed us to his home, and whilst we listened to his words of instruction, we rejoiced in the privilege we enjoyed. He referred freely to by-gone days, and seemed pleased to revive the reminiscences of the past. He spoke with interest of the prosperity of the church, and gratefully acknowledged the goodness of Him, who had thus far conducted it in its onward course. His conversation abounded with profitable

information. The allusions to himself were marked by his characteristic modesty, and when we rose to depart he thanked us for our visit, just as if our object had not actually been to sit at the feet of Gamaliel, but to confer a benefaction on himself.

This eminent servant of God, who was born in Germantown, Pennsylvania, in the year 1763, was descended from a German Protestant family, whose lineage can be traced back as far as the year 1599. Several of his ancestors were either engaged in the active duties of the ministry, or connected with institutions of learning as instructors. His father was the Rev. John Nicolas Kurtz,* a man of great intellectual and moral energy, who immigrated to this country in 1745, and labored long and efficiently in the ministry of our church. He was a good man—"one that feared God with all his house, and prayed to God always"—whose soul was imbued with the spirit of his Master, and who earnestly sought to carry into practice, the principles he professed.

"The sweet remembrance of the just,
Like a green root, revives and bears
A train of blessings for their heirs,
When weary nature sleeps in dust!"

His children were furnished, by precept and example, with the best instruction in practical godliness. They were the objects of the strictest parental care, and were shielded from the influence of evil associations. Indelible impressions were thus made upon their minds, and the most permanent effects produced. How often, as parents, are we unmindful of the almost omnipotent power which early training exercises over character, shaping it to good or evil issues, apparently with the force of destiny! Children will obey the lessons and follow the impulse given them at the fireside. Their plastic nature takes the forms and images around them, traces of which they retain the remainder of their life. The likeness will be stamped with more or less faithfulness. Everything noble and generous, as well as everything base and selfish, will awaken a lasting echo in the susceptible heart. The influence of a wrong bias, or a sinful example, may operate upon the youthful mind, like a spray of water that has fallen upon polished steel, which no subsequent effort can efface. Even a heathen moralist hath said:

*Nil dictu factum visuque hæc limina tangat,
Intra quæ puer est.*

* *Vide Evangelical Review, Vol. VI. p. 261 sqq.*

The son entertained a most profound veneration for the memory of his father. Although he had preceded him more than three-score years into the eternal world, he always spoke of him with great tenderness, and with much affection. Even in his last illness, when his mind wandered, he distinctly saw him in imagination, he conversed with him as if present, and words which he had heard uttered almost a century before, lingered on his lips.

"The record fair
Still outlives many a storm, that has effaced
A thousand other themes less deeply traced."

The subject of our sketch was sent to school at a very early age. In his sixth year we find him busily engaged in acquiring the rudiments of an education, at Tolpehocken, where his father was at this time settled. His teacher was a German, and a man of limited abilities. The only branches taught in the school were reading and writing, and the entire library consisted of the Bible, Luther's Catechism, and the Wurttemberg Lutheran Hymn Book. Very early in life, he felt the first inward desire towards the ministry. "This feeling," many years afterwards he remarked, "was indeed vague and indefinite, and wholly inexplicable to myself, but still the general idea took hold of my mind, that I must preach the Gospel. I must have manifested this idea, some how or other, to my schoolmates, for they and my elder brothers would insist on my preaching to them. They helped me on a bench or some other elevation, and then I would recite to them, in the most earnest and solemn manner, children's hymns and hymns on death, judgment, heaven and hell, which I had committed to memory. I was probably more affected by these exercises, than any of my juvenile hearers. I shall never forget them whilst memory holds a place in my mind, and I can recollect as vividly as if they were of yesterday's occurrence, how deeply my heart was moved, and what burning tears ran down my cheeks, while holding forth on these occasions. Whether my father was aware of these facts, and whether they had any influence in determining him to devote me to the ministry, I cannot possibly say. * * * * I soon learned it was my father's wish that I should study for the ministry, and this fell in exactly with my own secret and ardent desire."*

* *Vide* Autobiography furnished by the Editor of the Lutheran Observer, to which we acknowledge our indebtedness for the most interesting facts in this sketch.

In the year 1771 the father was induced to take charge of our Lutheran interests in York, Pa. The son preserved in his memory a distinct recollection of the thrilling scenes connected with this period, and with which, in his childhood, he so warmly sympathized. He was in his twelfth year when the war with England commenced. Like all who lived in those perilous times, he was fond of relating incidents connected with our struggle for independence. Some of these incidents came under his own eye, which, of course, made a deep impression upon his mind. He remembered very well the time when Congress sat in York, being compelled, because General Howe, with his fleet, had taken possession of the city of New York, to flee to Philadelphia, and not feeling secure from danger there, had crossed the Susquehannah to hold their sessions. There was also stationed, at this time, a division of the American army, quartered in part among the citizens, and partly residing in tents pitched in the vicinity of York. Bishop White, who served in the capacity of Chaplain to Congress, made his home with Pastor Kurtz, and it was the duty of young Daniel, and his twin-brother, to carry every morning, to this pious Divine, bread and milk, which constituted the whole of his breakfast. It was the habit of the Chaplain to dine out with different members of Congress. Subsequently the Spanish Ambassador was accommodated in the same room, and when he vacated it, it was given to the French minister, and finally it was occupied by a member of Congress from Charleston, S. C. During this period, the affairs of our country wore a gloomy aspect. Money was scarce, and the means of prosecuting the war limited. As an evidence of his father's interest in the cause, the son would tell how on Sabbath, after preaching, he invited his hearers to collect all the articles of apparel that they could spare, such as coats, hats, shoes and stockings, shirts, bed-clothes, &c., and send them to his residence, for distribution among the destitute, suffering soldiers. Our ministers who lived during the period of the American Revolution, were inflexible patriots, ready to render service for their country as occasion or opportunity required, and for their devotion to the principles involved, they were frequently the victims of persecution and suffering.

When peace was concluded, in 1783, the subject of our sketch was in the twentieth year of his age. He no longer attended school, but his time was not unemployed. He still pursued his studies, under the direction of his father, with

the same object in view, which had in early life arrested his attention. Although he labored under great disadvantages, his mind was gradually developing, and making progress in knowledge. His father, however, in consequence of his numerous and multiplied pastoral duties, concluded to send his son to Lancaster, for the purpose of prosecuting his studies under the instruction of H. E. Muhlenberg, D. D., of whose family he became an inmate, and for the kindness with which he was treated, he ever seemed most grateful. The first book which his preceptor placed in his hands, was a copy of the Latin Grammar, which he soon committed to memory. He was interested in his studies, and pursued them with much delight. "The hours of recitation," he says, "were the most pleasant I had, and I regretted that they were not more frequent and of longer duration. But my teacher, a man of endless labor and untiring industry, soon told me that I must learn to help myself, while he gave me the free use of his library, and liberty to occupy the room as the place of my study. His collection of books was, fortunately, large and judicious, one of the best then in this country."

As an illustration of his childlike simplicity and great inexperience at this period of his life, he gives the following amusing incident: "One day I found a work by Dr. Lardner, entitled 'Thoughts on the Demoniac Possessions recorded in the New Testament.' My curiosity I found unusually excited in discovering this book. I put it carefully away, and when the family had retired, I began to read it, and the more I read, the more I became interested. I continued to read and read, until finally I was ordered to retire. With fear and trembling I took my candle, alarmed at reading, as I, in my simplicity supposed, so profane a book, and filled with deep repentance and terror, I threw myself upon my bed, praying God to forgive me, and promising to be more faithful in the future."

During his residence in Lancaster he had an opportunity of meeting with a number of distinguished *savans* of Europe, who visited Dr. Muhlenberg, at the time justly regarded as one of the best Naturalists in the United States. Among these was Professor Schœpf, of Jena, who appeared to take a lively interest in his welfare. "One day," says Mr. Kurtz, when it was made my duty to show him my preceptor's mineralogical collection, he asked me if I felt any inclination to go to Europe to study there. I replied that I would do so with pleasure. He assured me that I could obtain gratuitous

instruction in medicine, and that he would make an arrangement with Dr. Lessz, to give me instruction in Theology without charge, and that a few hundred dollars would be sufficient to support me there for several years. I wrote to my father immediately, requesting him to furnish the requisite sum, and I would relinquish all claim to my patrimonial inheritance. But my request was denied with the expression of opinion, that I could learn just as much, where I was, as in Europe."

He remained in Lancaster for some time, pursuing his studies with unwearied diligence. At a meeting of the Synod of Pennsylvania, held in Philadelphia in 1784, after a satisfactory examination, conducted by Rev. Dr. Kunze and Rev. J. L. Voigt, he was licensed to preach the Gospel. In the year 1786 he was permanently invested with the sacred office, Rev. Dr. Helmuth being at the time President of the Synod.

On Mr. Kurtz's introduction into the ministry, he at first assisted his father in preaching, catechizing, and in visiting the sick. Soon after he took charge of the congregations in the vicinity of York. He had been invited by Dr. Helmuth to become his assistant in Philadelphia. The communication most earnestly urging the wish, was addressed to his father, who immediately handed it to his son, saying, "I do not advise you to accept or refuse—examine the question yourself, ask God's guidance, and then decide for yourself!" After mature and serious reflection, he felt that it was his duty to decline the offer. He was a modest man, and his limited experience in the ministry, made him conclude that he did not possess the qualifications requisite for the position. His decision incurred Dr. Helmuth's displeasure, yet he remarks, "The good Doctor did not know how much I revered him, how heartily I loved him, and how much his sermons moved me whenever it was my privilege to hear him, and how often he was the means of awakening me to renewed zeal in the discharge of my ministerial duties!" The alienation of feeling did not, however, continue. The warmest friendship subsequently sprang up, and the most intimate relations existed until Dr. Helmuth's death, in 1825.

Two years after he had entered the ministry, Mr. Kurtz, with his brother-in-law, Rev. J. Gøring, was appointed to make a missionary tour to vacant congregations, and scattered members of our church in Maryland and Virginia. They visited a number of important places, and were everywhere most cordially received. The following year Mr. Kurtz re-

peated the trip. On his way homeward, he passed through Baltimore, which was then beginning to attract attention by the growth of its population and the rapid increase of its commerce. He called to see our Lutheran minister, Rev. Siegfried Gærock, who appeared very much gratified to meet with the son of his valued friend, and requested him to fill his pulpit on the approaching Lord's Day. He cheerfully acceded to his wishes. Soon after his return home, his father received a letter from Pastor Gærock, expressing the desire that he would allow his son to become an assistant to him in the ministry. The father making no objection, and the young man acquiescing in the proposition, the call was accepted, and the duties at once assumed. The offices assigned him were, to preach once on the Sabbath, visit the school and instruct the children. He soon became a favorite in the congregation, and the most of the members desired him to perform pastoral labor for them. This very naturally gave offence to the Senior Minister, who, at the expiration of the year, let his assistant understand, that his services could now be altogether dispensed with. Mr. Kurtz accordingly told the people that the time having passed, for which he had been engaged, he would return home, and entreated them to remain united, and to live in harmony. He, however, very soon received a call signed by the vestry and several members of the congregation, urging him to resume his labors among them. Mr. Gærock occupied the old church. Mr. Kurtz's friends secured the use of a Methodist church. A conference of the two ministers was held, and terms agreed upon, by which the rights of each were clearly defined and plainly understood. The former, however, died a few years afterwards, when the congregations united, and the latter became the exclusive and regular pastor.

The subject of our narrative labored in this situation for nearly half a century, with great diligence and fidelity. He was repeatedly called to other fields, to Alexandria, Georgetown, Lebanon and Hagerstown, but he felt that it was his duty to remain where he was. In 1823, after he had been minister here for thirty-seven successive years, Rev. J. Uihorn became associated with him in his labors. Dr. Kurtz, however, continued connected with the church as Pastor until the year 1832, when, in consequence of advancing physical infirmities, having reached his three-score years and ten, he resigned—preaching, on the occasion, a valedictory from the

words, "Finally brethren farewell. Be perfect, be of good comfort, be of one mind, live in peace; and the God of love and peace shall be with you." The church, on his retirement, gave him the use of the parsonage so long as he lived, and settled upon him a pension during life. Although he had retired from regular pastoral service, he still occasionally preached, and was disposed to make himself useful whenever a suitable opportunity offered. We find him, when in his eighty-eighth year, delivering a discourse at the dedication of a church, from the words: "One thing have I desired of the Lord, that will I seek after, that I may dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life, to behold the beauty of the Lord and to inquire in his temple," and in his ninetieth year participating in the exercises connected with the laying of the corner-stone of two Lutheran churches. Also, by particular request, he officiated at a funeral when in the ninety-second year of his age. A church paper,* at the time, thus describes the occasion: "He delivered an impressive, connected and appropriate address in German, which would have reflected credit on his head and heart, even in the prime of his protracted and useful life. The scene was exquisitely touching: there, in the centre of the parlor, stood the time-worn veteran, the venerable man of God, who had endured the peltings, and passed through the vicissitudes of nearly *one hundred years*, surrounded by the grand-children and great grand-children of his primitive cotemporaries, long since descended to the silent darkness of the tomb. Supported by one hand resting on the back of a chair, and by the other on his faithful cane, he stood erect, and bore glorious testimony to the doctrine of salvation by faith in a crucified Redeemer, and to the inexhaustible richness of the consolation of the Gospel in Christ Jesus, in a tremulous voice indeed, but with a freshness and vigor which afforded proud evidence that God, in his mercy, had not yet permitted the fair fabric of the inner man to be invaded by imbecility, or even impaired by decay." His last official act was the baptism of his great grand-child, Edward Moreton Schaeffer. He reluctantly consented, because he could not see sufficiently well to read the form, and he was afraid his memory might prove treacherous, but his children and grand-children insisted. He therefore performed the service extemporaneously, and all present acknowledged that so solemn and impressive an administration of the ordinance they had never witnessed.

* Lutheran Observer, March 3d, 1853.

He seemed to retain much of his mental power and vigor almost until the last. He was confined to his bed only a short time before his death. No particular malady preyed upon his frame. His death was marked by the greatest tranquility and freedom from pain. The resources of animal life seemed only exhausted. His mind was calm and full of peace, his faith clung with an unyielding tenacity to the promises of the Gospel. With a serene and peaceful countenance, he anxiously awaited the summons to depart.

"He turns his steadfast eye
Beyond the grave, whose verge he falters nigh,
Surveys the brightening regions of the blest,
And like a wearied pilgrim sinks to rest."

Christ was with him and strengthened him in the hour of dissolving nature, and gave him a sweet release. The silver cord was loosed, the golden bowl broken, and the spirit returned unto Him who gave it. His mortal remains were borne by his friends to the Green Mount Cemetery, where

"They laid his silver temples in their last repose."

"Earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust," confidently "looking for the general resurrection on the last day, and the life of the world to come, through our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall raise his followers to the participation of his own happiness and glory in heaven." And as they stood around the opening tomb, profound silence reigned whilst the minister of God uttered those comforting words: "I am the resurrection and the life. He that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die." "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord from henceforth; yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors, and their works do follow them."

On the 5th of September, 1790, Dr. Kurtz was united in marriage to Maria Messersmith. "She was to me," he remarked on a certain occasion, "a valuable and faithful wife, a useful counsellor, active and frugal, and had a feeling heart for the poor and needy, and was generally beloved by all her acquaintances. We lived more than half a century in wedlock; harmony and love dwelt under our roof." She died in 1841, but her image in subsequent years never faded from his heart. This union was crowned with eleven children—three of whom are still living. Several of his children he lost in their infancy, in reference to whom he says: "I consider all

children as saved who die in their innocence; nevertheless, I have felt how painful it is to parents to follow their offspring to the grave, though we know to die is gain to them, and that after death they quickly mature to the happy state of holy angels. I believe that many adult persons, with all their pious wishes, by tottering, falling and rising, and with all their endurance, scarcely attain to a child's salvation."

It is the concurrent testimony of all who knew Dr. Kurtz, that he was one of the most upright and conscientious men that ever lived—a firm, yet unpretending believer in Christ, a most decided and consistent christian. Candor, sincerity, and strict moral purity characterized all his actions. Generosity, disinterestedness, and a lofty integrity, were prominent throughout his whole course in life. His noble mien, his benign and conciliatory spirit, and affable intercourse, secured the respect and admiration of all. Perhaps no one ever passed through so protracted a term of existence so distinguished in all the traits of a thoroughly good man. No one was further removed from every suspicion of intrigue or management for selfish ends. No one ever enjoyed, to a greater extent, the confidence and esteem of those who were intimately acquainted with him. His forbearance, gentleness, benevolence, were well known. His meek and quiet spirit was appreciated. His nature was that of genuine kindness, and he sought to promote the happiness of those around him. He was most tender of the feelings of others, and was not disposed to speak disparagingly of the absent, or to detract from any person's character. He was always careful in his remarks in reference to others. Perhaps his excessive prudence and timidity may have sometimes interfered with his usefulness, and embarrassed his efforts for doing good. He was retiring, modest and unassuming, possessed great humility, and was devoid of all that ambition which aspires to notoriety. He manifested no desire to refer to his own good deeds, or to claim any credit for what he had done. He rather depreciated his own ability. When reminded, only a year or two before his death, of some incidents in his own life, his reply was, "Let them pass—if the motive was pure, and the act good and useful, God knows it, and that is sufficient!" When his attention was directed to some severe trials he had experienced, he remarked, "We will say nothing about these. I have long since forgiven all my enemies, and prayed God also to blot out their sins. They no doubt think they were right, and intended not so much harm to me as might be supposed."

"This was all his care
To stand approved in sight of God."

There were no stirring events in his life, no remarkable episodes to distinguish the "even tenor of his way;" in the language of the clergyman* who officiated at his funeral, "not even a ripple ruffled the uniform calm;" but there was a beautiful harmony in his whole life, a combination of noble qualities, which enabled him to exert a constant and noiseless influence, to go forward in the faithful discharge of his duties and the fixed exertion of his purposes, conscious of his own integrity, and looking to God for the result.

He seems to have been a man of experimental piety, of deep religious experience. We find him, towards the close of life, using the following language: "I acknowledge it costs much to be a christian; many wrestlings, combats, prayers and labors are necessary, and a faithful perseverance throughout life. I praise my God that his anticipating grace, *gratia perveniens*, has been mine from my youth. I can recollect no precise period of time in which I can say that the great work of conversion has taken place. It is known that children, brought up by christian parents to early piety, have grown gradually in christianity. I am not one of those who, through storms and earthquakes, have been brought to a knowledge of the Savior, but through the still small voice of the precedent and preparing grace of God. But I do not find any fault with others, whose experience differs from my own. I only regret that I did not maintain and act out more faithfully, the christian sentiments wrought in my heart by the Holy Spirit. I had often and much to combat with flesh and blood, and I have still greater cause to watch over myself, that I may not be torn away from my Savior by the allurements around me, and the temptations of my own heart." Again he says: "I have much cause to lament that I have not lived a more holy and devout life. Far from all proud humility, I confess with shame, from the inmost feeling of my soul, that I have need to pray, 'Hide thy face from my sins, and blot out all mine iniquities,' and I have often prayed, 'Lord enter not into judgment with thy servant. Remember not the sins of my youth, nor my transgressions: according to thy mercy remember thou me, for thy goodness sake, O Lord!'" He was thoroughly evangelical in all his views. The cardinal doctrines of our holy religion were most precious

* J. G. Morris, D. D., Baltimore, Md., whose services on the Sabbath, he was in the habit of attending the last years of his life.

to his soul. All self-righteousness he renounced. He claimed no merit for any work that he had done. His hope of acceptance was based solely on the merits of the blessed Redeemer, to whose service he had solemnly devoted himself. "I hope to be saved wholly," he says, "through the free grace and mercy of God in Christ Jesus. I desire more and more to love, honor and serve God, who is my greatest Benefactor, both in life and in death! I adore Christ as my only Redeemer, who has died on the cross for me, and for the sins of the whole world; I wish to love him a thousand times more ardently and faithfully, and my neighbor as myself." "When I reflect," says he again, "on the mercy, forbearance and love, with which God has borne with me, his unworthy servant, I am a wonder in my own eyes, and am constrained to exclaim, 'What is man, that thou art mindful of him, and the son of man, that thou visitest him?' 'I was cast upon thee from the womb; thou art my God; I am not the least worthy of all thy members, and of all the truth which thou hast shown unto thy servant.'"

Although Dr. Kurtz was very much attached to the religious views under whose influence he had been reared, he was exceedingly tolerant and liberal towards those who occupied a different stand-point. He was eminently conservative.—Creeds and Confessions, in their proper place, he regarded as excellent things, but he did not wish them to occupy a wrong position. His motto was, "*In necessariis, unitas—in dubiis liberalitas—in omnibus caritas.*" Loving his own church, and sound in its faith, he was eminently filled with the spirit of christian love. "If only sinners," he would say, "are rescued from ruin, and trained for Heaven, let us bear and forbear." When told that the Methodists were gathering in our German Lutheran emigrants, and organizing churches among them, his reply was, "And is it not better that they should go to Heaven as Methodists, than be neglected and overlooked as Lutherans?"

As a preacher, Dr. Kurtz was ardent, instructive, and thoroughly scriptural. He presented the truth seriously, plainly, and most faithfully. His manner was earnest and deeply impressive. His countenance, as well as his lips, spoke the sentiments which he uttered. He was inclined to dwell on the great truths of christianity, in a simple and practical way, carefully avoiding everything like metaphysical speculation. Repentance towards God, and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, were prominent doctrines in his discourses.

The truth proved "quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword." The most marked results often accompanied the delivery of a single sermon. Once, when preaching at Frederick, on the danger of procrastinating the great question of eternity, a man after church went to the house of a friend and remarked, "I will now go home, make my will, and follow the good counsel of the preacher." On the same occasion, a celebrated physician came to him and said, "I acknowledge myself to be the bad servant, who knew the Master's will and did it not." A discourse he preached at another time, from the text, "One thing is needful," resulted in the conversion of several of his hearers. As a pastor, he was regular in his ministrations. He addressed himself to the work with great vigor and alacrity—ever the untiring, self-denying, devoted shepherd of his flock—and it is supposed that he effected as much good, by his pastoral visitations, as by his labors in the pulpit. In the home of the afflicted, and at the couch of the sick, his sympathetic virtues rendered his influence most appropriate and soothing—his intercourse, it is said, was useful beyond most of his fellow-laborers. His people generally regarded him with veneration and love, which could have resulted only from their long experience of his tender and diligent regard for their welfare. During his ministry, he baptized 5156 persons, buried 2521, and solemnized 2386 marriages.

Dr. Kurtz took a deep interest in everything connected with the welfare of "Jerusalem," to use his own favorite expression. He was one of the founders of the General Synod, a Director of our Theological Seminary, and was closely identified with all the benevolent institutions of the church. He sympathized with every effort that was designed to elevate the character of our people, and build up the waste places of Zion. He was also actively connected with the leading religious and eleemosynary associations in the city, of which he was so long a resident. He was one of the founders of the Maryland Bible Society. He, with Drs. Allen and Inglis, met, and after prayer for God's blessing upon the enterprise, resolved to form a union for the dissemination of the word of God throughout the State. He was a member of the Baltimore Dispensary, and served for several years as President of the Board of Trustees of the Female Orphan Asylum, until the infirmities of age incapacitated him for the duties.

The subject of our sketch was honored with the degree of Doctor of Divinity from the University of Pennsylvania, in

1816. He had a vigorous and inquiring mind, which he had improved by careful reading and study. He was a diligent student, and being an early riser, and never idle, he was able to accomplish more than men generally do, with the same amount of official labor. His library was large and well selected. He had an extraordinary memory. In his last days he would repeat the longest German hymns without the omission of a single word. In the early part of his life he devoted considerable attention to the study of the Natural Sciences. Botany and Entomology were his favorite pursuits, and he had gathered together quite a respectable cabinet. Its value was greatly increased by his correspondence and exchanges with distinguished naturalists of Europe. But in the latter part of his life he abandoned these pursuits, and devoted himself exclusively to the work of the ministry. Everything was made subordinate to his unreserved consecration to the cause of Christ. He conscientiously surrendered himself to the highest interests of his fellow-men, and to the advancement of the Redeemer's kingdom. "He counted all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus his Lord, that he might win Christ and be found in him." "Neither did he count his life dear unto himself, so that he might finish his course with joy, and the ministry which he had received of the Lord Jesus Christ, to testify the gospel of the grace of God."

Thus one and another of our great and good men, our beloved and honored ministers of the Gospel, are passing away! Thus are we all passing away! This sentiment is inscribed upon all things earthly. And soon will come the time, when

"The cloud capped towers, the gorgeous palaces,
The solemn temples, the great globe itself,
Yea, all which it inherits, shall dissolve,
And like the baseless fabric of a vision,
Leave not a wreck behind!"

Let us, therefore, be "followers of them who, through faith and patience" have inherited "the promises!" So that when "our earthly house of this tabernacle," which we now inhabit, is dissolved, we may have a "building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens!"

ARTICLE IV.

THE GROWTH OF INDIVIDUALISM.

By Edward McPherson, A. M., Gettysburg, Pa.

OUR subject has reference to the history of the Race. It involves the past trials and present position of the Human Family, and has an intimate connexion with its future aspirations and fortunes. It is, the distinct recognition by some governments, of individual rights denied almost from the beginning of human authority; the disenfranchisement of THE INDIVIDUAL, in mind, body and conscience, from the oppression which had almost crushed him; the gradual growth, in the State, of the man—each individual man, as a being whose rights are worthy of preservation and protection; the acknowledgment that it is not beneath the dignity of government, but is its rightful duty, to guard from injury every subject, and to secure to each his share in the dignities and honors, as well as the burthens and responsibilities of the State; the increased respect paid to the man as contrasted with the ancient idea of the mass; in one phrase, THE GRADUAL GROWTH OF INDIVIDUALISM.

This thought, not yet fully developed, is at the basis of all rational improvement in government. Without its distinct recognition, there can be no really progressive movement. The equality of all before the law is the grandest idea in government, and is the necessary corollary of that comforting truth of Religion, the equality of all before God. Thus, Christianity—in giving man a priceless individual value, in teaching him that he was created by God, is responsible to God and will be judged by God, in establishing, by means of conscience, a new and *personal* relation between man and his Creator, and in tracing all to a common origin and holding all to a common accountability—is, in truth, the parent of Individualism, and promises to work out a double redemption—saving Mankind finally, from the twin oppression of Sin and Tyranny. Before Christianity was revealed, this thought was not grasped; and Ancient Civilization, lacking Moral Power, lacked alike that spirituality which was reserved for a later period, and that true equality in government which is

now advancing to perfect development, with the increasing spread of Christian principles.

Ancient History abundantly illustrates this remark. Turning to hoary and imbecile INDIA, and viewing its firm Force-fixed organism—the iron-walled castes which offered liberty to one class and slavery to the rest; the system's claimed and conceded Divinity of creation; the abjectness of worship which the Brahmins wrung from the obedient mercenaries, the helpless tradesmen and the debased slaves; the polygamic practices which the lifeless religion sanctified; the enforced ignorance of the governed class; and the fearful vices which corrupted the rulers and the ruled—we see nothing of that brotherhood in Man, before which no such absolute inferiority of rights in some, and absolute superiority of rights in others, is possible to be maintained. Formed to aggrandize the possessors of power at the expense of its subjects, it maintained its unnatural position by the powerful weapons of Superstition and Force, and by its intended debasement of the mass and its degradation of the individual, gradually effected that mental and moral torpor which yet overspreads that Nation, lying now as then, unmoved by the shocks of centuries, and sternly, sullenly content in its despairing degradation. *There* INDIVIDUALISM never had a home, and men toiled in ignorance, and carelessness, of the approaching day.

The records of EGYPT show us little improvement. Its more active life, its less enervating climate, its more frequent contests, its unwearied industry and its less persistent passiveness developed one feature which the gloom of India does not present; but this was a modification, not so much of the enslavement of the people, as of the relative rights of the governing classes. The people were yet subjects—victims. And the splendor of portions of Egyptian History, its conquests over nature, its gorgeous temples, its massive and enduring pyramids, are proofs only of the loyalty and moral enervation of the subjects, not of the wisdom and kindness of the rulers. Old Egypt also, must be associated with a denial of the dignity of Labor to which it owes most of its fame, and with the degradation of the millions who inscribed upon wondrous and eternal monuments the records of the nation's achievements, and the names of its most glorious defenders.

PHENICIA was a nation of Laborers, and first emancipated Labor from the severest of the penalties under which it had suffered. Its people, from roving pirates became estab-

lished traders, and carried the works of ingenious artizanship over the wide waste of waters to the limits of the then known world. In this pursuit of the quiet occupations of peace, which required the constant plowing of distant Oceans, they increased their knowledge, gained new ideas of government, obtained new aspirations, inhaled a hatred of restraint, developed a bold and enterprising spirit which could not brook the mean restraints of priestly or royal power, and created conceptions which, however feeble when compared with the recent past, and however imperfectly shadowed forth in their institutions, should be acknowledged as theirs, and properly traced, as direct results, to their industrial habits, so different from the brutal conquests, bloody wars and destructive tendencies which absorbed the energies and marked the course of most of Heathen nations. There was developed the germ of that sturdy oak which, nurtured by the MIDDLE CLASS, afterwards overspread the nations and gathered, under its protecting boughs, millions who had long languished for want of its congenial shade. But their religion was barbarous and defiled them; their trade tempted the cupidity of their stronger enemies; and soon the Phœnicians disappeared, having but feebly illustrated those humanizing maxims whose spirit has shed a peculiar lustre upon Modern times.

In GREECE, appeared a people with a marked taste for arms, an exceeding restlessness of spirit, an intensity of patriotism previously unknown, a then unparalleled strength of feeling, a singular refinement of nature, a wonderful capacity for intellectual improvement, an absorbing love of the beautiful in Nature and in Art, and with ardent longings after Liberty, which they never understood and never obtained. One of these characteristics found gratification in constant wars which, sometimes with each other and sometimes with a common enemy, exhausted the contestants, and at last sunk the nation in its grave. Another was manifested in a discontent with the present, an aversion to indolence, and in ceaseless aspirations after an indefinite better. Another made them willing sacrifices for the good of the State, converting weak women into heroes, and nerving warriors to do and dare aught required for their country's safety or glory. Another gave directness to their efforts, unity to their purposes, and power to their resolves. Another quickened the development, and sharpened the perception, of beauties in moral feelings which their grosser predecessors had never realized or enjoyed; and found fitting expression in a milder and less terrifying form

of religion than had preceded. Another burst forth in those grand achievements which have inseparably connected the Grecian name with much that is attractive, inviting and ennobling in Literature, and have given their great masters the reputation of having, of all Heathens, made the nearest approach to the discovery of The Truth. Another induced the cultivation of those graceful tastes which furnished appreciative admirers to those matchless works of Art, whose surpassing excellence is yet a never-failing source of keenest pleasure. And another was the remote, but effective cause of those repeated grasps, those terrible throes, amid which, it was hoped, some plan of deliverance would be appointed to suffering, but aspiring Humanity. Of such were the components of the Grecian character. Their institutions, more liberal and more nearly individual than any which had gone before, called forth the powers of the CLASS, rather than of the MAN. The State was adored. The individual was subordinated. Political duties were ranked as the highest—higher than those of Religion, to which the State was preferred, and whose laws those of the State absorbed. Thus, while the State was elevated, the individual, in person and mind and conscience, was subjected, not to a few as hitherto, but to the aggregation of all—yet subjected, stripped of his privileges, his rights, his prerogatives. And in Greece, brilliant, immortal, glorious Greece, the home of sages, the nursery of philosophy, the birth-place of gentle Art, the venerable home of venerated men, we see no development of that grand thought, beyond which in sublimity only one other, its twin, was ever entrusted to the care of fallen, erring man.

In ROME is presented an evidence of the power of unquailing energy, devoted to material conquests. The Roman's theatre was the actual, not the ideal world. He revelled in the excitement of battle, and was never satiated with the pleasures of victory. His country was his God; her service his glory. He swept over the earth, overthrowing kingdoms, razing cities, devastating colonies, blotting out nations. He made his Capital the Mistress of the World, and forced through her streets, in galling chains, the chiefs of her conquered peoples. He made the Roman name known at the ends of the earth, and its utterance became his shield against oppression. He conquered the country as well as the people, marking the subjugation of the latter by taxes, and the former by monumental works connecting it with the Central City. But while conquering others, the Roman was not himself

free. That liberty had always been the liberty of Rulers, and it ultimately became the liberty of One to rule. The duty of the others was obedience. Their religion could not relieve them from this position. It was of human creation, was sustained by human laws, was dependent upon the State, was controlled by the State and was served by officers of the State. It spread superstition among the people, binding men to earthly things instead of lifting them to heavenly, and neglecting that government of self, without which no man or people ever rose to the enjoyment of actual liberty. It did not come between the strong and the weak, but permitted the father to sell or murder his child, and the master his slave. It did not bridle human passions or check human vices. And soon corruption overspread all classes. Wealth, Irreligion and Slavery consumed the former conquerors of the world; and the fierce Barbarians of the North won an easy victory over the enervated frames, broken spirits, and corrupted natures of the last of Heathen Nations. Rome, with its thoroughly centralized government, followed in the wake of others who sought to tread where Human Principles pointed. It buried Man under imperial magnificence; and both fell in a common ruin. But while all were humiliated, they were not destroyed; for amid the darkest gloom of that fearful period, when Man's powers for good had been fully tested and had wholly failed, the Day-star arose, and the CHRIST, long predicted, came, promising the elevation of Man, the destruction of his oppressor, and the regeneration of the world from the thralldom of passion, ignorance and vice.

Such, in brief, was Ancient Civilization, in its relation to Individualism. It possessed no law of right and wrong. It knew not God or the worship due Him. Of necessity, it was ignorant of the regard due to Man, who was created in His image. It embodied human ideas, but lacked those Divine Truths which alone can give lasting life and fadeless glory to a nation. It accomplished human purposes, but fell far short of those grand conceptions which were beyond the reach of unaided man. It, for a time, seemed to elevate the few, though at the expense of the many, but at last brought all to a common level in the dust: for, all connected with it—whether as Priests at the altar, Emperors in the palace, Philosophers in the Academy, Orators in the forum, Tradesmen in the marts, Senators in the Capitol or Citizens in their homes—all, the purest and wisest and greatest of them, wandered in dark valleys, whose gloom they could not penetrate.

They perceived dimly, so dimly that they could never grasp, the object of their search, and at last, in ignorance of its actual existence, they fell headlong under the weight of their manifold errors, follies and crimes—the issue of that Religious system which chained the many in debasement, conferred upon the few only the right to liberty, connived at the spread of slavery, established combats in which man was slain for sport, destroyed the moral sensibility, weakened the domestic feelings and stimulated the worst passions of the people, and degraded woman, sensualized man, and finally humiliated all. Man, polluted, degraded, despised in Rome, was yet to rise; but not by man. To the Maker of all, must we look for the redemption of all. Thus expecting, we turn a few more of the wondrous pages on which are recorded God's doings with His creatures.

In falling, the Romans gave two elements with which the new civilization was to be, in part, constructed. In conquering, the Barbarian tribes contributed also two—their characteristics of personal independence and individual attachment. Those of the Romans, were the Municipal system and the Christian church, which, at the close of the fourth century, had become a corporate body, with a complete government. Our attention, at present, will be more particularly with the latter. We have seen in the Heathen Religion, the causes of the downfall of Heathen Civilization. We will find in the Christian Religion, the causes of that wonderful prosperity, and that glorious liberty which later nations have secured. In this, we do not undervalue the influence exerted by the great political convulsions of the period to which we refer, but behind them all is to be recognized that influence which penetrated society, and gave tone and direction to its combinations. As Heathenism corrupted the world, Christianity purified it, by changing the motives to action, by modifying the opinions, improving the morals, and elevating the aspirations of the people. Yet this also had its conflicts, but, unlike Man's law, it conquered.

The Christian faith, properly understood and practised, would have at once redeemed the world from the folly and wickedness in which it had long been plunged. But its agents were men, and they often failed to meet the necessities of the times. This law of Love was a sweet sound to the multitudes who, and whose ancestors, had for ages suffered under the law of Force. But it was not a sweet sound to rulers, whose pride it would subdue, whose cruelty it would stay, whose

avarice it would check, whose anger it would quell, whose revenge it would proscribe, and whose favorite indulgences it proclaimed as sure to be punished hereafter with ceaseless penalties. Moreover, the prevalence of this law involved change in domestic customs, reforms in domestic institutions, modifications in internal policy. But change involved risk to permanency. Hence, when the new Religion had so far prevailed as to attract attention, it was viewed with hostility, but with a hostility modified by an expressed contempt for the flippantly-termed "outburst of fanaticism"—a convenient mode, not yet extinct, of accounting for, by sneering at, all new thoughts whose existence and agitation are offensive to the non-progressive members of society. Despised by those in power, Christianity slowly made its way among the lowly, the unpretending, teaching them priceless secrets not known before, not taught elsewhere, opening exhaustless fountains of consolation, reforming dissolute lives and directing anxious, beating hearts in those paths which lead to contentment here, to glory hereafter. Soon the number of the professors of the Christian faith increased, and extended from the lower to the higher walks of life. Then, Heathenism took alarm. Its priests feared for their livelihood—its retainers for their places—its advocates for their supremacy. Bitter hate arose; and ere long, biting persecutions visited those Christians who could not, and would not, renounce their glorious faith. The secular arm was outstretched—not to save—but to strike; and numerous, worthy, devoted were its victims. But human power could not reach, or remedy the disorder. It spread. Persecution purified the ranks of believers. It intensified the devotion of the steadfast. It made their heroism sublime. It developed in its victims a nobleness of resolve, a purity of purpose, which aroused sympathy in friends, and extorted admiration from foes. It raised Christians above the ordinary level of men; and in making them superior to human suffering, proved the claim that their religion was, indeed, from God. The persecution wholly failed in its purpose. The Church was not to be overthrown by violence, by Force. These weapons had hitherto laid low all the enemies of Heathen Rome; but against Christianity they were powerless.

The Christians persevered, teaching their doctrines, practicing their holy precepts, and amazing a corrupt and decaying world with their consistent, lovely life. In time, they became a large class in the empire. Ultimately, the persecution was stayed, the Christians were allowed to re-assemble

for worship in the buildings they had formerly occupied, and all exceptions against them were removed. Shortly the Emperor became a Christian, and took under his protection what he defined to be the church—a position far more dangerous to its integrity than the frowns and hatred of his predecessors. The Imperial Government confirmed the Bishops in their sees, and recognized their authority; whereupon the Bishops, strengthened by the civil arm, exalted their offices, extended their powers and magnified their dignity. The government of the church was modeled from that of the State; and below the Bishops were placed various grades of subordinate officers, with the laity divided into various ranks possessing varying privileges. New influences entered the church; and soon a council, held about the year 300, declared that freedmen whose former owner was living, were debarred from promotion to any rank of the clergy. A tone of contempt for inferiors, runs through its canons, showing how the church had lost its spirituality, how fearfully it had already yielded to the blandishments of the worldly-powerful, and how the liberty it then enjoyed was rather the liberty “to scheme, to quarrel and to oppress, than the higher liberty to endure, to forbear and to rest.” The church soon became torn with dissensions, which continued to rage, though met by some earnest spirits with words of quiet, sober remonstrance. Old controversies were revived. New controversies arose. And the Christian world was kept in perpetual antagonism. In one of these contests, one party declared for the liberty of the individual to make his own creed; the other advocated the power of the church to form doctrine for all to believe. The latter prevailed, assisted by the influence of the Emperor; and another step was taken toward the same centralization in the church as was prevailing in the State. But *this* centralization was destined to be greater than *that*, for it was to overshadow the Empire. Ambrose fought this fight and conquered—exalting the ecclesiastical above the temporal. But the liberty he gained was for his order, not the subject-classes whose liberty was rather diminished than increased by the newly-extended dominion of the Bishops. The tendency to centralization continued, and soon a Council declared the inequality of the Bishops, erected another and far more exclusive order, and elevated the Roman and the Constantinopolitan Bishops above the rest. Siricius, recently elected to the former, enforced the decree, and exercised and consolidated the pre-eminence awarded to his office. The celibacy

of the clergy was established for the double purpose of effecting by it their isolation from the people, that the people might be more securely controlled, and of making the clergy, by separating them from their inferiors, more dependent upon their superiors. Under the influence of a policy of which this is an example, clerical indulgences reached such an extreme, that scourging was by no means an unusual mode of punishment, and with this condition of morals among the clergy, what must have been the condition of the laity? The existence of these disorders was urged by some as proof of necessity for a more vigorous government; whilst by others, as a reaction against centralization, Monasticism was originated. The monk, in his retirement, was at first liberated from the excessive watchfulness of the clergy, and was independent of the priesthood. Such was the oppression of centralization that many devoted themselves to monastic life. But soon *their* dream vanished. The monastery was invaded by unhallowed footsteps. Force became an essential of its government, and the liberty pursued for centuries, again disappeared as a phantom. Centralization prevailed among the Roman Christians, and liberty was virtually abandoned. The rulers of the church became as oppressive as those of the empire; and the Northmen came to dethrone both. We know how the ponderous blows of Alaric curdled the blood in the veins of the Emperors—how “the blasts from the North covered the earth and the seas with gloom; how, as the tempest rose and the ocean heaved beneath it, the ebb of centralization began; and how, in place of an unbroken dominion, there appeared from beneath the waters, the peaks and jutting lands upon which Liberty would one day be enthroned.” Likewise, but not so markedly, did they disturb the Religious Centralization which overshadowed the church. The Northern Christians aroused the Roman Christians from their lethargy, having brought with them the principle of the PROMINENCE OF THE INDIVIDUAL, whose protection, in contrast with the Roman idea of the prominence of the State, was the great object of the Northern codes. But this influence proved temporary, and soon signs are visible of a tendency to return to as vigorous anti-Individualism as the church had assumed under Constantine. The inferior clergy were deprived of the power to choose the superior; while the superior retained the power of choosing the inferior. Then the church formally denied the “rights of individual reason,” and claimed the

right to persecute for heresy. The church also early deprived the laity of any influence in its government, and claimed for the clergy the exclusive power to study and decide upon all theological questions. It became, in time the defender of religious and civil despotism. Not at all, was it the exponent of individual Liberty. It often defended the people against the bad government of their rulers; but when "any step was proposed to be taken to establish a system of permanent institutions, which might effectually protect liberty from the invasions of power in general, the church always ranged itself on the side of despotism." Despotic in its organization, having condemned free inquiry and shown contempt for individual reason, what more natural for the chiefs of such an establishment than to array its power with those who, sympathizing with it in religious opinions, held the strong places of the earth, and were capable of adding to its stores and increasing its importance?

The principles indicated as having governed the Church, gradually grew in strength; and some were added to meet emergencies. The grossest abuses followed; and when the resurrection of the modern mind came, the church essayed to trample upon it—to re-inter it, and to make still more dismal and revolting, the black and dreary despotism which had been erected upon its grave. In this it failed. It had departed from the peaceful spirit of the Gospel it professed to teach. It had set at naught sacred, eternal principles. It had attempted to destroy, when it should have assisted the growth of, the earnest aspirations after coming good. More than this: It placed itself between the anxious spirit and its God, requiring that all their converse should be through its priests. It instituted auricular confession, that terrible engine of oppression, invented that through it the priest, informed of the heart-secrets, might be made the more absolute master of the man. It inflicted upon him severe penances, as though physical suffering was the proper atonement for spiritual transgression. It divested the man of all his attributes within its reach, and conferred them upon the church. It deprived him of all means of spiritual improvement, save in the narrow mode of its appointment. It condemned all individuality of opinion. It claimed infallibility for its judgments, tolerating no exceptions to its decrees. It invented imposing ceremonies, gorgeous forms, attractive rituals, to captivate the Barbarians and please the ignorant, superstitious masses—ceremonies and forms and rituals, under whose magnificence were

buried, as all formalism is sure to bury, the simplicity and vitality of religion. It seized the man in its iron arms, and squeezed money out of him, or consigned him to perdition. It enveloped the man in the thing. It made permission to commit crime, and immunity from punishment for crime, a matter of barter, and filled its coffers to overflowing, by the violation of the most sacred precepts. It coldly, designedly, murderously, built itself—a huge, overshadowing, desolating despotism—upon the ruins of Man's Personality. Such was the vast corporation—the vast, soulless corporation, as it presented itself to the view of the men of the Sixteenth Century. It had become so, step by step. One by one, those monstrous claims had been made, insisted on, and wrung from an oppressed people—a people, however, not yet so schooled to oppression as to be beyond indignation at its enormities. This indignation ensued, having spread over many nations; and at length the time arrived, for the battle between the Champions of the Church and the Champions of Humanity. Germany—part of that portion of it on which the Roman soldiery had never trod in triumph, the birth-place of the virtuous, home-loving, woman-respecting, liberty-claiming Teutons, who furnished the “regenerating element in Modern Europe”—was the fitting theatre for this grand conflict, big with the fate of millions. The contest we need not describe. All know it. All, also, know its glorious issue—how the first well-aimed, well-struck blow was given to a grasping and tyrannical Hierarchy—how a conflict was begun which is not ended, and will not be, until Man be everywhere freed from civil and religious oppression—how philanthropists rejoiced, and greedy, bloated churchmen mourned, over the first victory of the long-vanquished—and how the Protestantism of Luther, Melancthon, Zwingli and Calvin spread over neighboring nations—how it broke fetters from thought—how it laid the foundations of large, free and prosperous empire—how it first sundered the firmly-forged chains of Religious Despotism—how it rescued Religion from the false interpretation of the corrupt and designing, and made it accessible to all through The Book which contains the development of its doctrines—how it broke the artificial barriers with which a cunning church had separated Man from his Maker—and how distinctly it enunciated those never-dying truths which, having their origin in the Bible and their basis in the excellence of God's design and the completeness of His work, are destined to regenerate the world, and drive Wrong back to the

dark den in which it had its birth. Thus, by mighty men, through a mighty Revolution, and by giant efforts, was rescued from unhallowed purposes, the Church of God, whose high destiny it was and is, to be an important instrument in the deliverance of Man from the depravity of earth to the glory of Heaven. May its Ministers always realize the importance of this mission, and their responsibility in it; and never may they flag in their fidelity to this great cause, or in their efforts to effect this matchless achievement!

The noble principles enunciated by the Reformers, were the nourishment which suffering mankind needed. They filled the public want, and promised to create the strength which would ultimately give deliverance. But everywhere, their old enemy resisted their growth; and the old weapon, Force, was unsheathed to drive back the new invasion. Bloodshed followed; and, amid deep internal convulsions, mutually exhausting efforts and rivers of martyrs' blood, in too many nations Liberty was again chained and buried beneath the triumphant tread of the heartless tyrant. Pursued by a remorseless Power, and sometimes betrayed by irresolute friends, the Reform ceased its rapid progress, and whole nations relapsed into sullen hopelessness. There they lie to-day, and we need make no further reference to Continental Europe. Without material exception, it sleeps in chains. It has had spasmodic wakings. But the Church and the Crown yet hold it in their brutal grasp. Over all those fair fields, MAN pines—the ruler, in Church and State, grows fat, corrupt, fiendish. This will some day end; and terrible, without a parallel, will be the avenging horrors of that day. We need not seek to portray them.

But for one bright page, we might close the book of European History. Briefly interpreting it, we shall turn from the painful recollections of the past to the substantial joys of the present, and the pleasant anticipations of the future. The bright page is, of course, the history of ENGLISH INSTITUTIONS, which proved, in many a critical period, the impassable barrier Despotism could not overcome—which often saved liberty in Europe from utter overthrow—and which, though imperfect, have done a great work, of which the friends of Human Liberty, and we especially, have no right to be ignorant, and to which we have no right to be insensible. We speak not in commendation of every act of the English government. We could do that of no government. Nor of every feature of its Institutions. We could

do that of no government. But of the general usefulness of their liberal system in the progressive development of Individualism. In connexion with the growth of their Institutions, and as essential to the proper appreciation of them, as well as our own, we must briefly refer to the various people who have contributed to the formation of the English nation. The Celts were bold warriors, were without fortified towns, and were divided into numerous independent tribes, having many kings and petty rulers. They were Druids in Religion, and their priests were almost the only civil magistrates. With the Romans came the division of the country into townships, each possessing powers of self-government, taxation and election of Senators—the beginning of that municipal freedom and self-rule which has distinguished English civilization, and is its vital spirit. The Saxons brought an aristocracy of wealth. Each township had its lord and its chief officer, who was elective—elected its representative to the courts of the hundred and shire—regulated its own police—and was bound “to keep watch and ward.” The hundred court was held monthly, and the County courts twice a year, from which there was an appeal to the Supreme Court—an aristocratic body presided over by the king and attended by the Bishops and Earls. Every member of the commonalty was bound to place himself in dependence upon some man of rank. The Saxon Ceorls were personally free, were legal witnesses, had certain political rights, and could become thanes. The Saxon Thralls were in a state of slavery; and criminals who could not pay their fines, were liable to be reduced to that condition. Thus, the democratic and aristocratic elements entered largely into the Saxon polity—the latter prevailing. The system of the Danes was substantially the same. And while the Saxon nobles were beginning seriously to menace the independence of the Crown and the freedom of the people, the Normans subdued the island, and ruled it with an iron hand. They established new tenures for land, introduced new divisions of race and class, confiscated and divided among themselves the greater part of the lands of the conquered, rejected as servile and barbarous the English language, filled the high offices in Church and State with men of foreign birth, and placed themselves upon the necks of their despised victims. While William the Conqueror thus aggrandized his followers, he was careful to strengthen the throne by introducing the Feudal system, modified so as to make himself the supreme lord of all the land, and as such

requiring an oath of fealty from each land-holder, to prohibit sub-infeudation, and to scatter the nobles and thus diminish the probabilities of rebellion. He enlarged the jurisdiction of the royal tribunal, and contracted that of the baronial courts. He discouraged, by severe penalties, the private warfare which the Feudal system had elsewhere encouraged; and he established his authority upon a firmer footing than any cotemporary monarch in Europe—in his anxiety to strengthen the throne, weakening alike the nobles and the people, and thus, in the future, necessitating that union of those two powers, elsewhere hostile, which finally resulted in the diminution of the royal prerogatives, the comparative independence of the other orders, and the beginning of English Liberty.

Under the severe legislation established by William, and maintained by his successors, up to John, the condition of the people became pitiable in the extreme. Of the two millions who inhabited the island at the commencement of the Thirteenth Century, nearly one-half were in a state of slavery—either *villeins regardant*, who were attached to certain lands and passed with them, or *villeins in gross*, who were bought and sold, and passed from master to master, without respect to land. The latter villeinage involved an obligation of perpetual service which only the consent of the master could dissolve, created an incapacity of acquiring except for the master's benefit, allowed the master to alienate the person of the slave in the same manner as other property, descended from parent to child, and gave the master an arbitrary power of punishment, in which the life of the slave was inadequately guarded. Slaves "knew not in the evening what they were to do in the morning, but they were bound to do whatever they were commanded." They were always liable to chastisement and imprisonment, and to be sold and separated from their families. At one time the law provided that if a male villein belonging to one lord, married a female villein belonging to another lord, their children were equally divided between the two slave-owners. Slaves were carried to Denmark and Ireland and elsewhere, and sold; and "into Saxon hands the price was paid for Saxon peasants." Such was the pitiable condition of the English peasantry but six centuries ago! Our Saxon forefathers early acknowledged the cruelty, the inhumanity, the wrongfulness of such a relation; and in this same century, offered facilities for the emancipation of slaves, while they placed obstacles in the way of an increase in their

number. Among the obstacles were these, named by Creasy: A lord might enfranchise his villein, and the law inferred enfranchisement from many acts, such as the lord's vesting the ownership of lands in the slave, or accepting feudal homage from him, or entering into a sealed obligation with him, or pleading with him in an ordinary action. There were also many modes of constructive enfranchisement, such as the villein's remaining unclaimed a year and a day in a privileged town. The burden of proof always lay upon the lord, and villeinage could only be proved in one of two ways: either by showing that the slave's ancestors had been the property of the claimant and those through whom he deduced title, or that he had confessed his villeinage in a court of justice. But if the alleged villein could prove that himself, or one of his ancestors through whom villeinage was claimed, had been born out of wedlock, he was liberated. For the law held an illegitimate child *nullius filius*, and, of course, unable to inherit the condition of villeinage—a rational rule, far more defensible than that of *partus sequitur ventrem*. Thus, with the commencement of the common law of the complete English nation, we find it providing means for the gradual and ultimately certain extinction of slavery, which was finally effected, to the lasting honor of the English people, and of those English judges who, having too few imitators in our day, hedged up, by their decisions, the way of the claimant, and bent the whole power of the law to the relief of the weak and oppressed, who most needed its protection. The result of the English policy was to assist in the construction of a grand system of Individual Freedom, which has covered with glory the names of those who, in early times, laid broad and deep, its firm foundations; but the harsh and unmanly policy of too many of our American judges, is disgraceful to our position, variant from our principles, and demoralizing to our people—thus threatening to be fatal to the liberties of all.

From William to John, there was no mitigation of the laws enforced by the former—the intermediate Sovereigns having carefully guarded their prerogatives. One hundred and forty years after the Norman Conquest, John ascended the throne. His was exactly the character to provoke the contempt and hostility of a virtuous people. It was also the character to be overcome by the perseverance of a determined people. For he was utterly destitute of high moral qualities, and was as feeble to retain, as William had been powerful to achieve, the supremacy of the Crown. Lingard says that he was full

of dissimulation and suspicion; was polluted with meanness, cruelty, perjury and murder; was ambitious and pusillanimous; and was arrogant in prosperity and abject in adversity. History burns with the records of the outrages of the monster against, alike the honor of many private families, his ecclesiastics, his barons, his peasants and every class of his subjects—outrages which quickly developed throughout the kingdom a deep-seated feeling of hatred, before which he was soon deservedly humbled. The contest to which his policy led, need not be related—how he defied, and then tamely submitted to the Pope—how he sought to detach the clergy from the Opposition, first by intimidation and then by entreaty—how he braved, then supplicated, and then offered to bribe the stern and uncompromising Barons—and how he attempted, by numerous cunning evasions, to avoid affixing the royal seal to MAGNA CARTA, whose grant has made the name of Runnymede immortal, and the 15th of June, 1215, one of the most lustrous days in National History. This Charter, which became the bulwark of English liberties, was general in its provisions, defining the extent of the feudal obligation of the Barons and other immediate tenants of the Crown, extending to the sub-vassals the mitigations obtained by the Barons, securing the ancient liberties of cities and boroughs, prohibiting arbitrary imprisonment and arbitrary punishment of any kind, limiting the power of the Crown over the property, as well as the person, of the subject, encouraging trade and those engaged in it, furnishing the germs from which afterwards grew the representative principle embodied in the English Parliament, guaranteeing trial by a jury instead of by one person and that the nominee of the crown, and containing the foundation of the right to the great writ of *Habeas Corpus*. But its grand feature, which was, in Lord Chatham's opinion, "worth all the Classics," was its protection to the personal liberty and the property of all freemen, as given in these words: "No freeman shall be taken, or imprisoned, or be disseised of his freehold, or liberties, or free customs, or be outlawed or exiled, or any otherwise destroyed, nor will we pass upon him nor condemn him, but by lawful judgment of his peers, or by the law of the land. We will sell to no man, we will not deny or defer to any man, either justice or right." Thus completely, and for the first time in the history of earthly governments, was recognized, what was taught eighteen centuries ago in Judea, the complete equality before the law of every citizen; and was guar-

anted the protection of him in his claim to the enjoyment of his Individual Rights. For a mode was established, by which the King could be compelled to respect and obey all the obligations of the Charter, which has been solemnly confirmed by Kings and Parliaments more than thirty times, and has received the addition of important privileges, during the many years of conflict between the King on the one hand and the Barons and People on the other. But, as was said of the Roman, may be said of the English Constitution: "No one man and no one age sufficed for its full production." On the contrary, it was the accretion of many centuries of faithful labor, and the work of many fearless, upright, intelligent and sagacious generations of men.

So thorough has become the importance of the Individual, that the supremacy of law over royal power is now an established rule in England, and every individual has the right to resist an illegal act against his person or property, by whomsoever attempted. The right of Freedom of Debate in Parliament, and the immunity of the representative from all answer elsewhere, long contested by the King, were ultimately wrested from him, as also the Freedom of the Press and the personal Freedom of legislators—valuable principles without which free government is impossible, and every invasion of which, upon however specious pretexts, should be sternly resisted. Parliament also wrung from the King and his Council, the right to determine the qualifications of their members, to regulate the right of suffrage among the people, to check the direct interference of the Crown in the elections, and, in various ways, to protect the nation from the grasping tendencies of Royalty. It was made illegal to raise and keep a standing army in time of peace, without consent of Parliament. Trials for treason—once a common mode of destroying men odious to the King—were surrounded with peculiar safeguards. Judges were made independent of the Crown by appointment for life and removal in a specified manner only for cause shown; and the King was estopped in his efforts to overawe Courts (as James had memorably attempted with Lord Coke), and to drive them to the denial of justice. And thus amid perpetual controversy, sometimes amid sanguinary conflicts and the dethronement and beheading of tyrannical monarchs, the brave people of England have risen from an oppressed, down-trodden mass, to a position which no other Europeans enjoy; and they have given an

impetus to the cause of free institutions everywhere, which will be felt to the latest period of time. In this country, much ignorance prevails concerning the safeguards which surround the liberty of an Englishman; and much prejudice exists against aught which has an English origin or bears the English name. But such prejudices, however natural to be felt, and however improperly sought to be perpetuated, are unworthy of an intelligent people, and will be dissipated, the more generally become known the facts, that English Institutions were the basis on which ours were built, and that our Common Law had its origin and partial development among the baronial castles, the free towns, the unpolished society of the early English. The civilization of England is one of Liberty. Its people are more imbued with the spirit of Liberty than any other in Europe; and when the freedom of that Continent was threatened to be destroyed twice in the personal recollection of many—first by Napoleon with his brilliant centralized government, and next by Nicholas with his ponderous Autocracy, England was the nucleus of the league which drove back the invader, defeated his purposes, and saved Individualism from an early and untimely grave. For all this, our thanks are due to that great power which, with its many errors, with its inequalities, with its oppressions and with its wrongs, is the repository of European liberty, the hope of Europe's regeneration, and the breakwater upon which the waves of despotism have spent themselves in vain. Its institutions are eminently individual in their character; and its flag waves over not a single slave, over no man who is not, in his right to life, liberty and property, the equal of every other. They have elevated the man, surrounded him with securities, given him substantial certainties, protected him in the enjoyment of what he has, guarded his family and property from the hands of the spoiler, and placed below him, above him, around him, the guardian influences of a liberal polity—a polity which the first William insidiously sought forever to make impossible, but for which the falsehood, treachery, avarice and tyranny of James and Charles compelled a conflict, and which the firmness and wisdom of Hampden, the learning and integrity of Selden, Coke and Glanville, the address and eloquence of Pym, the patience and fortitude of Elliot, the courage and impetuosity of Cromwell, and the sturdy principles of an aroused, outraged and indignant people painfully evolved and inaugurated, and which the blood of a host of willing, glorying martyrs has

cemented, and made, we trust, as permanent as the principles it seeks to perpetuate, and as lastingly brilliant as the bold White Cliffs of that sea-girt coast—those glittering battlements which ceaseless waves have washed and howling storms have beaten for centuries, which first greet the gaze and rejoice the heart of the returning, and last linger in the vision of the departing voyager, and which have been transmuted, by the alchemy of eight centuries of toilsome experiment, into joyous, radiant Watch-towers of Liberty. In church, as in State, England fails equally in the complete development of Individualism. But let us hope that as greater abuses have yielded to the pressure of the truth, ere long those remaining will also vanish, displaying a governmental structure which, enduring for ages, will constantly grow in usefulness, beneficence and glory.

Thus, wherever we look—in Asia, Africa or Europe—we see much to sadden, much to remind us that MAN is still rising, not having yet risen from his long and deep debasement. The process is slow and painful. For its nearest approach to completion, we must leave those old and blood-stained fields, polluted by Force, contaminated with fraud, soiled by crimes, and covered, mountain-high, with the innocent slain. We must turn to a virgin soil, dedicated by a new people to the beautiful experiment of showing that it is possible for men to be brothers.

Some centuries ago, numerous brave, bold, conscientious men left England and the Continent, to seek homes in a new hemisphere, where they might, unmolested by jealous government, unawed by tyrant officials, develop the radical truth proclaimed to the world by the sturdy Republicans of the Netherlands, that "Liberty must not be a boon of the government, but that government must derive its rights from the governed;" where they might, without danger to estate or life, believe, assert and practically enforce the nervous declaration of Algernon Sidney, that "the liberties of Nations are from God and nature, not from kings." Bearing with them an intense love of liberty and an earnest desire to be free, they came to an unbroken forest untouched by old and corrupt institutions, among savage Indians without long-confirmed despotic government, with its train of deeds of Violence and Wrong. They sailed to a land which was then, substantially, as it came from the hands of its Creator—pure, unsullied—a *tabula rasa* from which there were no marks to be erased and on which all marks would at once become visible. They came

from under the rule of the Oppressor, intent upon founding a government under which no tyrant should ever lift his horrid front, no legal inequalities of class should exist, no wrongdoing should be sanctified, no right should be denied; but under which MAN might have a worthy theatre for the full and untrameled development of his moral and intellectual endowments. With these high resolves, these noble purposes, those Puritans, Presbyterians and Cavaliers left their ancient, and approached their future homes. They were, most of them, men of Education, and all had brave, honest hearts. They had read how grinding had been the hierocracy of India, how hopeless the mixed despotism of Egypt, how fitful the liberty of Greece, how ephemeral that of Rome, and how Man had long and vainly struggled on the Continent with a centralized State and a centralized Church above him. They knew how hardly won had been the precious concessions obtained by their courageous Fathers, and how repeated had been the efforts of the rulers to revoke the privileges granted. Some of them had been imprisoned in the Tower for too great boldness of speech. Others had refused to pay the ship-money and been wearied with long and iniquitous persecutions. Others had aided in the dethronement of Charles, and at the Restoration, had been compelled to flee their country. Others had refused to pay their tithes to the Church, and to their sorrow discovered that *their* home was not the home of Religious Liberty. And others, who had not personally suffered, had been told these wrongs until they were a familiar tale; and had religiously sworn, as they knelt by their patriotic, Liberty-loving mothers, an eternal enmity to every form of Oppression over the mind or body of Man. Of such was the early emigration from Europe to America, men trained to hate—not merely to dislike and delicately disapprove, but in their deepest heart to hate—the tyrant and his deeds—men raised up by God to lay the foundation-stones on which the first great Temple to Liberty was to be erected. And well, almost worthily of their Guardian Spirit, they did their work. But not at once was it accomplished, though soon it was begun—for in healthy hardship they sorely spent their long apprenticeship. The first trenches were dug, deep and wide, into their mother earth. But slowly the ground was cleared, the spot prepared, the materials gathered. The workmen studied each his duty, the architects carefully prepared their plans, the people thoughtfully amassed the necessary means. All—the order of the scene, the calmness of

the principals, the determination, industry and single-mindedness of those engaged, indicated a full knowledge of their position, and gave evidence that here no ordinary men were gathered, that here no ordinary work was in progress. Evil rulers at their old homes had pursued them into their wilderness-fastnesses, with harsh and unconstitutional legislation. Our Fathers were then law-abiding men, and had confidence in their brethren who composed the English people. They did not rashly meet the crisis. They protested against the Wrong, and petitioned for a redress of grievances. They avowed their loyalty to the Highest Authorities of the Realm, but asked those Authorities not to remove the old and cherished landmarks of the Constitution. Modestly but firmly, and with marvellous skill and ability, they addressed successively the Throne, the Parliament, the People. They appealed to each, for the repeal of the illegal acts; but England's ear was deaf. Her justice slept. She had espoused the wrong. She had refused to retract, and her colonies were free—not yet free in fact, but free in this: that they were strong in the Right, and were favored by Heaven. The tocsin sounded through these beautiful valleys and along these grand towering mountain-tops. The people heard, and obeyed the summons. They sent their best men to a Continental Congress, where, after careful deliberation, prayerful thought and much wise counsel, they *resolved to be Independent*. They appealed to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of their intentions, and to the God of Battles committed the decision of the contest which the Mother had provoked, and which the children could no longer avoid. The conflict ensued, and at last the decisive battle was fought. The Right was triumphant. The weaker had conquered the stronger; and the world was again taught how necessary that Nations should do right before God if they would be strong before men. The enemy departed vanquished. The colonists were in undisturbed possession of their long-beleaguered homes; and now the time had come for the erection of the Temple for which they had been for years preparing. Eventful period! Vitally important undertaking! But there were giants in those days—moral as well as intellectual—and they were equal to their duties. They had read, pondered, and, most of all, felt. They were not theorists merely. They were practical statesmen of great learning, acute perception, enlightened conscience and unsurpassed wisdom. They were not perfect. They did not wholly avoid error. But they

wrought marvels, as Europe and America unitedly proclaim. They addressed themselves, absorbingly, to their task, and well and in the proper place, they firmly fixed every block, where it would best knit the rest, best sustain the whole. In the building, they used, besides the pure granite of their native hills, every stone which had been laboriously hewn by their Fathers from the flinty thrones of the Plantagenets, the Tudors and the Stuarts. And for the "head of the corner," they used *that* stone, of which we read that other builders once rejected it. Massive, but graceful, the Temple rose to completion, sixty-nine years ago, when, as it was surmounted with the Cap of Liberty, the Nation was struck with its fine proportions, its elegant dimensions, the wonderful fitness of its parts. As it was on the grand gala-day of the Union, when its adoption was celebrated by a grateful and joyous people, it is this day—as bright, as beautiful. Long may it continue to fill our admiring gaze, and never may it fall before the violence, the anger, the degeneracy of the sons of its builders.

In their deliberations, our Fathers early encountered a great difficulty—the unfortunate prevalence, in most of the States, of a condition of slavery, which is at variance with the declared principles of our government. All those wise and good men lamented its existence, and sincerely regretted the apparent impossibility of its prompt removal. They, however, relieved themselves, as far as possible, of all connexion with it, and handed the control of the "institution" and the responsibility for its continuance therein, to the States in which it existed. They carefully and intentionally avoided giving, in the Constitution, any sanction to the idea that man could have a right of property in man, and with an emphasis which cannot be misunderstood, they described as persons those unfortunate beings now claimed, by sectionalism, to be as thoroughly property, *by virtue of the action of the National Constitution*, as the beasts of the field. Even in the rendition clause, the language used applies as well to apprentices as slaves, and contains no recognition of a master's *ownership* in either. Thus the horrible theory that Human Slavery is recognized by our National Constitution as part of American Institutions, to be as indefinitely extended as American emigration to the Nation's Territories, is overthrown as well by the language of the Constitution as by the well-known wishes and intentions of its framers, and by the Congressional legislation of the period of its adoption. What-

ever rights of property masters possess are created and secured by State Law, and are therefore, confined to State limits. The Constitution is not a Slavery-establishing or Slavery-extending instrument. It was framed in an enlarged spirit of liberty, and was intended to confer the blessings of liberty, not the curses of slavery, on all, as far as practicable, within its reach. But while doing this, while protecting, as far as in them lay, the Constitution from being turned into a means for the extension and perpetuation of a monstrous wrong, and while making it, as far as in them lay, a means for the extension of freedom, its great framers were not authorized, and did not undertake, to settle the details of the relation between the master and his servant. That has been done by the States. With these details we have no especial concern. They have, however, so far modified the natural rights of portions of the residents of this country, as to make it necessary to say, that when we proceed to speak of the guarantees our laws give to INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY, the remarks must always be considered as having exclusive reference to the *unmixed* white Race alone—whose weaker, and more ignorant and debased members were once in as abject slavery in England, as the negroes and the numerous crosses of the negro with the white, are in the South. And not only must these remarks be confined to pure Caucasians; but, to a certain extent, to the whites of the North—since it is too true that in the South many social privileges are seriously modified by the “peculiar institution,” and that poor white laborers, poor white school-teachers, poor white servants and others not connected with the local Aristocracy, have not that adequate protection against personal injuries and even destruction to life, which our government in theory recognizes as equally the right of all. So restrictive, if not subversive, is the slave “institution” of the rights of portions of the white Race; and so perverting is its influence upon even the course of justice. It is the existence of Human Slavery—the antipode of that INDIVIDUALISM for which we plead—which alone detracts from the sublimity of our Institutions. Sustained by Force, and denying natural rights, it is such as has marked painfully the world’s history through the long path we have pursued it—such as has disgraced and destroyed many other governments—such as materially limits our influence for good—such as will set bounds to our National Existence if, in its treatment, we are unfaithful to our religion, our age and our declared principles—such as we hope *will*

soon disappear from the face of the earth and as *must* disappear before universal peace and good will among men are finally established. In America as in Europe, grievous oppression still abounds. May more holiness be infused into the counsels of both Continents, and may justice soon be done to all, not withheld from any, bearing the likeness of our God!

As might be inferred from what we have said of the early training and the matured feelings of the men of '76, they were fully aware of the evils inherent in priestcraft as well as kingcraft—and among the earliest-settled of their principles, was the utter repudiation of any union of Church and State. They wished no consolidation of the temporal and spiritual power. They wished no church establishment to eat the substance of the people, and impair the vitality of religion. They wished no religious orders to introduce pride and self-sufficiency among the clergy. They wished no stately magnificence to crush the meekness—a crowning beauty—from the religion of the Lowly Man. And they went beyond the Mother country, and decreed that there should be no established religion in the Republic. After providing that *spiritual* oppression should not subdue the energies of our people and stain our soil with martyrs' blood, our Fathers sought to make *civil* oppression impossible. They placed the Executive power in one of the people's choosing, gave him a limited tenure of office, and defined his powers so clearly that, if ever exceeded, the act has been of design, not accident. They deprived him of all legislative power, except in conjunction with the Congress of the Nation, in which the "States as corporations and the People as individuals" are represented. They denied him the right, though unfortunately not deprived him of the power, to bring on a state of war, and they lodged that great right in Congress alone. And they so hedged up his way with checks and difficulties, that an Executive cannot do much evil, without a virtual disregard of his oath. The powers of Congress are also accurately defined, and a Supreme Court is established, with a life tenure of office, to hold and adjust the balance between the various branches. Thus the people have protected themselves in limiting the powers of their servants, and have most wisely guarded against the destruction of their liberties.

Voting is a most important civil duty; and upon its intelligent and conscientious discharge, the stability of our institutions depends. Hence, as a security against undue influ-

ence upon the Individual, the voting of the people, except in those few States which have not yet fully grasped the idea of the Liberty of the Man, or having grasped it fear to embody it in their legislation, is done by ballot, to the end that the greatest independence of action may be secured, and the poor and weak may be protected from the overawing influence of the wealthy and powerful. On the other hand, the voting of our representatives is done *viva voce*, that the constituent may know whether his sentiments have been represented. The elective franchise is, except in a few of the less progressed States, given to the man, not to his property, as in England. And the right to a seat in our Legislative Assemblies is not confined to certain classes by a property qualification—the idea expressed in June last upon the floor of the National Senate, and there endorsed by sundry members, that no man without the amount of property required in the Constitution of South Carolina, is fit for a legislator, being repudiated by the mass of the people, as out of harmony with our theory of government.

Our Courts are carefully guarded so as to protect the many and facilitate the dispensing of justice. The English Common Law—"the living vigorous law of a living people"—the law of seven centuries' growth which the men of the Revolutionary period placed as a shield between them and their Home Oppressors—the law of liberty which tolerates no such thing as superiority and inferiority of rights—the law which overbore the Civil Law when it threatened such destruction to English liberties as has everywhere followed its reception—the law which repudiates the slavish maxim of the Institutes that "the will of the Prince has the force of law," and substitutes that other and wiser maxim, "that the King is subject to God and the Law"—this healthy, sturdy law is above all, watching all, protecting all, equalizing all. Every man's home is made sacred, and is protected from the pollution of even an officer's footstep, except in a few specified cases—a precious right which the police of the Continent daily and atrociously violate. The right to the great writ of *Habeas Corpus* has become a most important privilege, and, as intended, protects the individual from all unlawful and indefinite imprisonment—except, indeed, he be incarcerated for alleged contempt of Court, for which our Judges generally claim the right to imprison, without question or interference from any quarter, an alleged but not convicted offender,

until they choose to order his release—a claim which, if well founded, gives those officers a dangerous authority, the most absolute in the country, which it is contrary to the genius of our government should be deposited in a single hand, and which, if it has not been, may become here, as it has been elsewhere, the source of much personal wrong from an irritated Judge to an odious or proud-spirited suitor. A well-guarded penal trial is secured to all indicted for crime; which requires distinctness of accusation by the prosecutor, gives the accused the benefit of all presumptions of law, secures publicity of trial and furnishes all the essentials to the complete protection of the MAN from the immense power of the government—essentials which were unknown in Rome and Athens, and are almost unknown on the Continent of Europe, where the presumptions of law are against the prisoner, where the judge is uncontrolled by settled rules of evidence, where he is permitted to subject the accused to rigid examinations, to conceal the offence charged and to refuse to compel the attendance of the defendant's witnesses, and where every artifice which ingenuity can suggest, is used to bear down the accused and unprotected. We have a fair trial before a jury who are required to give a unanimous verdict; and no citizen is excluded, as in England, from the jury-box—a mode of trial, the fairest ever devised, and a most necessary and valuable protection against general injustice. We have no attainder of blood, and visit no man's offences upon his children. We have a written Constitution, the general guardian, which, though threatened to be somewhat changed from its original intention by the violence of party feeling exerted upon judicial officers, we may hope will be spared serious mutilation. We enjoy the benefits of an unfettered, and generally escape the evils of an unlicensed, press. We have the right of free locomotion within the country, of free egress from it and of free regress to it—a privilege that those do not lightly value who know the annoyances of the passport system, and the vile uses to which it is frequently applied. We have perfect protection in our epistolary correspondence; and the mails, secure from such Vandalism as exists in France, are daily freighted with missives of every variety. We have the inestimable liberty of worship, which it cost Englishmen many a perilous conflict to wrest from unwilling hands, and which other nations have fairly earned by blood but have not yet obtained. We have freedom of trading and freedom of producing, either of the

fruits of the field or of the cunning of the hand. We have protected the person of the man from debasing and mortifying punishments. We have secured to woman the control and enjoyment of her property; and while elevating her socially, have given her a legal position she nowhere else occupies. We have subordinated the military to the civil power. We have the invaluable right of petitioning our legislators—a right solemnly guaranteed and generally yielded cheerfully. We have, especially in the North, no peculiarities of social system, to make manual labor disgraceful, to socially and politically debase the poor, and, thus much, to crush the energies and wound the sensibilities of the Man. We have no taxation such as afflicts Europe, nor are the contributions of our people spent in supporting privileged classes, ministering to depraved appetites, or corrupting any portion of the population.

Such are some of our privileges, which, in comprehensiveness and variety, have been equalled by those of no other people. We have all of value in every system which has preceded ours, and we have added much which was only possible to be obtained in a new country, isolated from jealous and powerful neighbors, and separated, by time and distance, from the political centres of the Old World. Our Liberty is not the highest capable of realization. But it is a vast progression upon what has been elsewhere realized. In the opinion of many excellent, sagacious and patriotic men, we are loosening in our hold upon fundamental principles; and are thus endangering the permanency of what we have. If this be so, the fact is another illustration of the tendency of nations to forget in prosperity the virtues which carried them safely and honorably beyond the perils of adversity. And that it is so, is too probably indicated by the recent unparalleled violence in various portions of the country; by the frequent assaults and murders upon the public streets of many of our cities and towns; by the fearful prevalence, every where, of disregard for the personal rights of citizens; by the substitution of the more rapid, but more dangerous, arbitrament of force for that of the law; by the brutal beating of one Congressman in the Senate House by another for words spoken in debate, and the shamefully inadequate punishment of the violator, as well of the privileges of the Senate as of the laws of the country; and, above all and worse than all, by the vitiated public sentiment which quietly connives at, and even openly commends, the more atrocious of

these violations of the spirit of the Constitution and of the foundation-principles of Individual Liberty. We have a "solid embankment of institutions," which it is cheering, inspiring to contemplate—which it would be shameful, dastardly to weaken, by departing from the sublime spirit in which they originated—the love of Individual Freedom, the desire to dignify Man, the anxiety to advance the Human Race. Let that spirit ever animate us; and let that be promptly discountenanced which, however plausibly concealed, aims a blow at the virgin bosom of our American Divinity.

A brief comparison yet claims attention. We have seen what Man was under the lifeless despotisms of Asia and Africa. We have seen how little of good, Greece and Rome brought to those beneath their sway. We have seen how Europe flowed with blood in the protracted, and yet uncompleted struggle between Man and those in authority. We have seen how, under Providence, England troublously obtained the large measure of liberty which, in the progress of events, has been vouchsafed to her. And we have seen what has been accomplished for Man on this Continent, in a period marvellously short, compared with the ages which are past. The review gives us much for thankfulness—not anything for vainglorious boasting. Yet consider the most advanced of Heathen nations, compare the condition of Man in them with his condition in America, and how striking, amazing, appalling the contrast! In Greece or Rome, Man separated from the State, was nothing. He existed in and for the State. He was useful, valuable only as belonging to the State. His rights were worth preserving, only because likely to benefit the State. An intense State-feeling, swallowing up affection for parents, for lover, for wife, for children, almost for self, everywhere prevailed. Patriotism was a Greek or Roman's strongest passion—a patriotism which was thus excessive because destitute of the moral element which came with Christianity, to subordinate its exercise to high and binding principles. And the man was most honored and most dignified, not when he became wise, virtuous, learned; not when he mastered science, made great discoveries, and explored Nature's mysteries; not when he unravelled Truth, exhorted to purity of life and practised what he exhorted; but he was most honored and most dignified when he was introduced into the citizenship of the State! Such was the Ancient, the Heathen, the Natural, the Human conception of Man's dignity—such their estimate of his value—such their idea of his desti-

ny. They thought citizenship "the highest phase of Humanity," and classed duty to the State as the highest of earthly obligations. No comment can better show how fearfully the ancient civilization was tainted with earth, how little it knew of Heaven.

Turn to America. In the ages which have intervened between the decay of the Roman and the birth of the American, the true Religion has been revealed. Christianity has come, teaching Man his origin, his duties and his end. It has shown him his individual consequence involved in his individual accountability; and, lifting him from the meshes of government, has planted upon his brow the signet of the Almighty. It views him as a Man, not as a Citizen. It teaches him to demand his privileges because they are his birthright, and to yield others theirs, because they have an equal title. It prescribes his duties to the State, but enjoins that the State shall not receive his adoration, for naught that is earthly is worthy of the worship of an immortal soul. It has created within him deep spiritual wants the Heathen never knew; and in filling them, has lifted him far above the reach of the passions which destroyed Antiquity, infinitely beyond the cravings of the Ancient heart. It leads him from the low instincts of life to the higher; and in fixing his love and duty upon the Great I Am, it has elevated his nature, refined his feelings, purified his heart; and, in making him a worthier man, it has given the State a better citizen than ever gloried in the title of a Roman. His country no longer absorbing all his feelings and duties, Patriotism—a blind, bigoted, unreasoning Patriotism—is no longer the sole passion of life. And the Man is now most honored, not when he seeks to "place himself upon a level with the Gods by means of labor, misery and combat;" not when he delights in the use of destructive agencies against his fellows; not when he conquers his country's enemies and lays waste their homes; not when he merges all other feelings in a burning passion for his country's glory, and not when he receives the apotheosis of an excited people; but when he conquers himself, suppressing the evil of his nature and drawing forth the good, when he practices virtue and is as a shining light in the world, when he exhibits in his life the beauty of holiness, and is just to others, watchful of himself, dutiful to God. Such is the Modern, the Divine, the Present glorious conception of man's dignity—such our estimate of his value—such our idea of his destiny. The Man, the State and Citizenship are ex-

istent as before, but with how changed relations to each other and for how different purposes. Then Citizenship was the low aim of life, and the State was before the Individual, receiving his affections, expecting his services, and governing his duties. Now, the Individual is before the State, and is bound by an immutable law to serve his Divine Master with a perfect obedience. Man is elevated to a higher existence, requiring more exalted duties and ending in a more glorious future; but the State and Citizenship are dethroned. Instead of being ends, they are but means—means to develop what they anciently destroyed, means to “secure the highest possible development of Humanity in this world and for the world to come.” Such is the purpose, the animating spirit, the pervading genius of American Institutions—the Improvement of Man, the Regeneration of Man, the Immortalization of Man—these three grand thoughts being the concentrated utterance of the sixty centuries of mockings, imprisonments, scourgings, and martyrdoms which our Race has lingeringly, sometimes restlessly, and always agonizingly endured. An aim which would require for its fitting portrayal, a heart of gentlest purity, a brain of highest gifts, a tongue of intensest brilliancy of flame.

The education of man here to fit him for the presence of his God. Such is the exalted, the inspiring mission of America—not the mere intellectual development, but with it the moral, that seeing the Right, Man may know it, do it, and glorify his Maker. Man needs such a government, such a friend, such a teacher. For centuries, he has been defiled, bruised, marred by harsh and cruel treatment. His dignity has been disregarded. His rights have been denied. His faculties have been stupefied. His Divinely-given powers have been undeveloped. His spiritual nature has been but feebly enlightened. He has been chained in ignorance, vice and superstition. Church and State have conspired to rob him. The one has refused him happiness here or hereafter, except upon conditions its hypocritical priests imposed. And the other has prohibited the enjoyment of his inherent rights, that the purposes of designing knaves might be accomplished. Thus for centuries has it been. But it continues no longer. *Here*, a beginning—a bold, promising beginning in Man's complete emancipation has been made. Among Americans, has this great work been almost exclusively-commenced. To us, has been offered the honorable privilege of participating in the keen pleasure it promises, in the exceeding honor its

fulfilment will involve. Let us gladly, but thoughtfully, accept the position assigned us. Let us seek to fearlessly perform the duty devolved upon us. Let us prove worthy of the singular distinction. Let us work, with tireless hands, with exhaustless energy in the noble cause. Let us labor to check the universal tendency of our depraved nature to outrage the dependent and defraud the unprotected. Let us aim to cultivate among all, a high-toned morality which, without other than an inherent compulsion, will promptly yield to each his rightful demands. Let us resist all organized systems of corrupting the public, by vitiating their morals, exciting their passions, or dethroning their reason by inflaming their brains. Let us seek to diffuse among the people the blessings of an education for mind and heart, which, teaching men their duties, their powers, their rights and their destiny, will make it impossible for others to become masters or themselves slaves. And, with this great purpose in view, let us support, guard from mutilation, and assist to increased development the Common School system of our State. Let us try to improve ourselves, do good to others, and thereby carry out, at once, the sublime injunction of the Bible and the beautiful theory of our government. Let us assist in filling the great wants of the Country and the Age, that, with Editors more independent our newspapers may be more reliable; with a populace more intelligent and more virtuous, our Fathers may be more domestic in their habits, and our Mothers less frivolous in their conduct; with teachers more faithful, our youths may be better trained; with tradesmen more honest our purchases may be more secure; with politicians more honorable, our politics may be less offensive; with statesmen more moral and less rash, our National Policy may be, in many things, less indefensible; with legislators less corrupt, our legislation may be more reputable; with a judiciary less innovating and more Freedom-loving our rights may be more stable and our Courts saved from becoming outposts of Tyranny; with a Bar more conscientious, guilt may be more surely punished and innocence more securely shielded; and that with a Clergy more earnest, more courageous, more radical and less temporizing, we may have a Church more pure, more spiritual, more vitalizing and more scriptural. And, finally, let us pray for the universal prevalence of our Holy Religion, to the end that all unnatural distinctions between men may be leveled, that virtuous principles may be strengthened, that the Right may be advanced, and that the world may be improved, progressed,

converted. Having done this, having given of our thought, our prayers and our labor to the cause of INDIVIDUALISM, we may justly feel as if we had not failed in our duty to God the Creator, or to Man the Creature; and we may, with confidence commit the issue to the Wise Disposer of Events, "who doeth all things well."

ARTICLE V.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF AN ACTRESS, AND THE TENDENCIES OF THE STAGE.*

It has been said that each individual life, with some modifications, would furnish material for a romance, and that personal recollection might take the place of invention. This is certainly the case with the book before us. The incidents in the life of its subject are sufficiently diversified to make an attractive volume to the lovers of light literature. Whether it will be as harmless as some of these mere creations of the imagination and fancy, is another question. With this autobiography there is a defence of a certain thing, which is utterly indefensible. We followed the real actings of the heroine with interest, until she stood upon the stage. We then became wearied and sated with her varied imitations. As she stood in the "star dressing room," on the first night of her appearance, and witnessed the discomfort and sham of everything behind the scenes, did it not occur to her that these things were typical of the life upon which she was about to enter? and that as the stream can neither rise higher, nor become purer than its fountain, so every moral influence proceeding from the stage must partake of its own empty and artificial, if not positively vicious, character.

In an autobiography of personal experiences, the veil of the heart is torn away or put aside, and strangers are permitted to look into the inner sanctuary. As our object, however, is mainly an examination of some of the arguments, here advanced, in defence of the stage, we can only glance at the autobiography. As we have gone over its pages, enam-

* Autobiography of an Actress: or eight years on the Stage. By Anna Cora Mowatt. Boston: Ticknor, Reed, & Fields.—1854. "Eighth Thousand."

elled with flowers sparkling with dew, the authoress reveals herself as possessed of talent, spirit, and energy, with a strong will which, in a cherished plan, will not brook disappointment. So vivid is the portrait that she has incidentally given of herself, and so transparent the medium through which this portrait is presented, that we see her revealed as a woman of much beauty, with engaging manners, a voice as musical as Apollo's lute, and what is better than all, a loving, kind disposition. Of the strength of her will we have an exemplification in an act of her early life: a dark spot impairing the sunny whiteness of her youthful experience. At fifteen years of age, a very "young America," of the gentler sex, she left her father's house, clandestinely, to go to that of a clergyman, in the same city, where she was married to Mr. Mowatt. She was accompanied by one of her sisters, who had most earnestly, but in vain, dissuaded her from the step. Her chidings of conscience, and her emotions at parting from her unsuspecting parents, are well brought in to soften and shade the self-will and defective delicacy of an act, which no parent can think of but with feelings of the deepest disapprobation. That a female should never marry against the will of a parent, we have no idea of asserting. There is a period of life when law, and good sense, and intelligent conscientious conviction, make every female the ultimate arbitress in her matrimonial destinies. But this is not in her minority. Indeed it is seldom, as a matter of fact, that a daughter either wisely or safely marries at any age, without the consent of her natural guardian; and certainly never during her minority, without a breach of that first command with promise, which requires honor to the parental relation. And if it be urged, as it sometimes is, that this matter of runaway matches is rather one for jocose remark than moral disapproval, our reply is, that it seldom proves so in the end, to any of the parties concerned. They who know the aching solitudes of a parent's heart, recognize no pleasantness in anything which would extenuate, or make light of it. Our authoress, moreover, in the course of her biography, enters upon the discussion of a question which deeply affects the health and welfare of human society. We may, therefore, properly note any antecedents which may vitiate, or give force to any of the arguments brought forward.

But a reconciliation was very soon effected. Tears pass away. The authoress is the mistress of a beautiful villa on

Long Island. From "dewy morn to quiet eve" her time is all her own. She divides it between studies and recreations. Ever and anon there is a gala day, upon which she and her sisters enact original plays for the amusement of their friends, or give concerts, or exhibit *tableaux vivants*. About this time she visits Europe, and spends fifteen months abroad. Her passion for fetes, and displays, and theatrical performances was, of course, amply gratified. In the meantime, Mr. Mowatt has been threatened with loss of sight. The most famous physicians of Paris are consulted with little good effect; partial relief finally being obtained from an eminent American surgeon. Upon their return to America, a fete is gotten up by the authoress, at her beautiful house on Long Island, to celebrate the fact. The play written and performed for the occasion, was *Gulyard, or the Persian Slave*. This was published in the *New World*, with many flattering accompaniments.

Up to this time, life seems to have been as a joyous holiday. Here, however, the scene changed. Mr. Mowatt lost his fortune; and the authoress seems to have borne this reverse with as much equanimity as she afterwards did the shifting of the scenes in the unreal and mimic representations of life upon which she subsequently entered. With womanly heroism she determined to use her talents, the gracious gifts of nature, to the removal of her husband's embarrassments. It was, therefore, determined to begin a course of public readings, from Dramatic authors. Her first appearance was in Boston. She was heard with sympathy and admiration. Thus encouraged, she appeared in other cities, and finally in her native city, New York. Here, after fulfilling an engagement, her health broke down: involving in its restoration the application of Mesmeric agencies, and the conversion of the patient and her husband to Swedenborgianism. This last phase of experience is so much out of the usual course, and yet contains so much of what has been lately disturbing the ill-balanced minds of our public, that we may turn aside for a moment, to subject it to an examination.

To mesmerism, Mrs. Mowatt says she is indebted, more than once, for relief from prostration: a relief which could not be obtained through any other agency. She sometimes remained in what is called the somnambule state, for hours, and on one occasion for weeks. While in this state she often conversed with her husband on the subject of religion; her conversation being much more fluent than ordinarily, with a

facility of improvising verses on any given subject. On one occasion she gave as her creed a synopsis of the doctrines of Swedenborg, before she had ever read a line of his writings. So clear was the exposition of this faith—would that this first and last clear exposition had been taken down in writing, if not for the benefit of the authoress herself, when awake, yet for all the after defenders and opponents of Swedenborgianism—that it was recognized and claimed by a disciple of the New Church. She was informed that her inner revealings were in exact accordance with the utterances of the Arcana. This led her, together with her husband, to examine Swedenborg's works. The result of the examination, to both of them and to several other members of her family, was a full conviction of the truth of the doctrines of the New Jerusalem Church. The amount of the argument seems to be about this: mesmeric agencies have the power of translating one into a state of higher consciousness; a state out of which the patient passes when demesmerized, but into which, by these agencies, he passes again, and takes up the same train of ideas and associations, which were broken off by the act of restoration to ordinary consciousness. In the movements of this *higher* consciousness—why should it be called higher rather than lower, from above rather than from beneath, is not stated—she recognizes a light superior to that which comes through the exercise of our ordinary powers; a light equivalent to that of inspiration; for this is substantially the claim of Swedenborg: that of putting a new and occult interpretation upon the dictates of the revealed Scriptures. She has confidence in these dreams of the mesmeric state, and the external things that surround her do not dispel the illusion.

We might leave the argument just as it is, for the benefit of the curious, were it not for the light which it incidentally throws upon other phenomena; and its resemblance to the manner in which certain other pseudo revelations have been made to our world. The fact of which the authoress speaks, is not confined to the mesmeric sleep, but is frequently experienced in the ordinary process of dreaming. We have sometimes, when in perfect health, and frequently, when the system was in a morbid state, like that of the authoress, had an experience, in ordinary sleep, very much like that which she describes: the mind reasoning in sleep to certain ideas, and trains of thought which had formed the material of a previous dream, and following them out, forgetful of the waking inter-

val which came between. We have little doubt that more than one of our readers with that amount of dyspepsia vouchsafed to ordinary students, and with a moderate observation of their mental states, have had a like experience. Something of the same character, although different in degree, is described by De Quincey in his confessions. The reader will remember his troubles with the Malay, the Consul Romanus, and the constant recurrence of the same pictures to the mind, and the same class of ideas during his dreams, produced by opium. The "Suspiria," published subsequently, seem, in fact, to be a continued delineation of these opium experiences. We have little doubt that the Epileptic experiences of Mahomet, in the cave on Mount Hara, and the revelations of Swedenborg, a much better man, were very much of the same character; and they are to be met with in abundance among the religious experience of the uneducated, especially of the African race. There is a short cut through these knots by saying that they are all imposture. But it is not at all a satisfactory one. That there is a state of sleep, in which the experience of former sleep is taken up again, as broken off by a waking interval, there seems to be little doubt. That such mental state is the usual accompaniment of an abnormal physical condition, is as little to be questioned. With Mahomet, and Swedenborg, and our anchoress, and our colored religious population, these dreams of a distempered system are accepted as revelations from above. And as a natural consequence, the individual, although reasoning correctly and vigorously on all other subjects, finds himself unintelligible *upon this particular subject* to almost every one else. It is quite refreshing to those who like to understand what they are reading, to pass from some of the results of Mahomet's higher consciousness, into that lower vein of plain common sense rascality to which he manifestly gave utterance in his waking moments. The same manifest change, we are told, is seen in passing from the scientific works of Swedenborg, with which we have never met, to those which are more strictly theological. And we have little doubt that had our Authoress recorded some of her experiences, in full, in her autobiography, they would have presented quite as great a contrast with the other portions of her graceful and sprightly narrative. As to the fact which seems to be so much insisted upon, the correspondence of her own dreams with the doctrines of the New Church, it is really not all remarkable. The same general correspondence will be found among all the systems of

Mysticism, most of them originating, as they do, in the same abnormal state of the physical and mental systems. It may be mentioned, for the benefit of the reader, that it has been, and is now, a disputed point, among the members of the New Church, as to what are the views of their apostle upon certain points. The revelations of our authoress correspond with the right views of course!

With the full acceptance of New Church doctrines came—

“The cheerful faith, that all which we behold
Is full of blessings.”

“All things in life wore a different aspect. I realized that the things which befall us in time, had no true importance, except as they regarded eternity. Whatever we received from above was good, whether it came in the shape of prosperity or misfortune, for it was but a means to fit us for our future states. It became easy to perceive that the most trivial of

‘Our daily joys and pains advance
To a Divine significance.’

Life’s trials lost all their bitterness.” What does this mean? There is a christian sense in which it may be charitably interpreted, and we would fain give the writer of it the benefit of all doubts. But she has expressed herself in a very unguarded manner: a mode of expression but too accordant with much that we are hearing from certain writers of the present day. As we have read her language we have been reminded of the sentimental theology of Byron’s *Hebrew Melodies*, of Moore’s sacred poems, and still more forcibly of certain lines of Burns’, which were not improbably composed under the discomforts of a previous course of debauch.

“If I have wandered in those paths
Of life I ought to shun,
As *something* loudly in my breast,
Remonstrates I have done.

Thou knowest that Thou hast formed me,
With passions wild and strong,
And listening to their witching voice,
Has often led me wrong.

Thy creature here before thee stands,
All wretched and distrest;
Yet sure these ills that wring my soul,
Obey Thy high behest.

Sure Thou, Almighty, canst not act
From cruelty or wrath,
O! free my weary eyes from tears,
Or close them fast in death."

Or to put it still more forcibly in the language of Carlyle's *American Ape*:

"The Divine effort is never retarded, the carrion in the sun will convert itself into grass and flowers, and man, though in brothels, or jails, or on the gibbet, is on his way to all that is good and true."

We trust that our authoress would not endorse the theology as presented in these quotations. But is it not substantially the same? If whatever we receive from above be good, where is that wrath of God upon the wicked, and his condemning judgments upon the sinner, of which the Bible so often speaks? "All things," we are told, "work together for good," to a certain class, not to all alike, as this question would indicate. "They work together for good to them that love God;" for evil, to those by whom God's love is perseveringly rejected. There is an immense amount of this religious sentimentalism to be found in our light literature. And it exactly falls in with the indolence and depravity of the natural heart. What an opiate to the conscience of the worldling, who is living altogether without God, or to the high-handed offender, who has outraged every law of His promulgation, to know that everything which we receive from above is good; to merge all the Divine attributes into one, that of an unreasoning and sentimental benevolence!

We lose sight, however, of mesmerism and Swedenborgianism, in the glare and splendid successes of the theatre. The scruples hitherto entertained by the authoress against going upon the stage were removed. She became an actress, running a successful career, both in this country and in Europe. During this career she was brought in contact and social intimacy with some of the most refined and elevated of both sexes. Statesmen and authors, and editors, alike joined in their expressions of admiration; and, to a certain extent, gave their sanction to the argument which she has presented in favor of the stage. We are perfectly willing to take them all together, Mayor Seaver, Professor Longfellow, Mr. Whipple, and Mr. Clay, as giving it a full endorsement, in all its parts. If sound, their names or practice cannot help it; if unsound they cannot save it.

Before entering upon this argument, however, suppose we look at the *thing* to be argued about. A glance at the theatre, *as it is*, will best enable us to appreciate its force or its worthlessness.

To do this, let us take our stand in front—not of the Howard Athenæum, with its throng of refined intellectual Epicures, such as probably never before, and will never again meet within the walls of a theatre, nor of some four or five more of rarely exceptional cases—but of those of the ordinary, or better class, in our large cities. Some great attraction evidently is about to be presented. The rather dingy-looking building, by daylight, with its closed doors and shutters, is becoming filled with new life, and light, and animation. From a little distance, we notice the throng as they press in, each one to his respective place, and through the well regulated places of admission. There is no danger of the frail daughter of Eve—whose particular sin and its consequences will so soon, perhaps, call forth abundant tears of sympathy, from floor to ceiling—coming in contact with her purer sister. There are ample accommodations for both, well known to their respective associates, and the paths are so arranged that they never cross. Neither, again, is the intellectual voluptuary at all interfered with by his coarser brother in the pit, the bar room, or “among the gods.” The tastes of all except the serious, earnest child of God, are recognized and provided for; and all, with the exception of this class, avail themselves of the offered banquet.

“How fast the flitting figures come,
The mild, the fierce, the stony face,
Some bright with thoughtless smiles, and some
Whose secret tears have left their trace.”

Yes, there are aching hearts, and eyes tearful from real sorrow, even in that palace of earthly pleasure; pains and sorrows not unfrequently finding their origin in this very scene of fascination, which is now resorted to, as affording temporary respite from their corroding influence.

But the crowd begins to slacken, for the house is filled, and the performance is about to begin. With an involuntary pang, in the recollection of hours wasted years ago, we again in imagination cross those portals, and look round upon the foil and gilt, which in the glare of gas light, seem like gold and silver. There they all are. And there behind the scenes, although we cannot see them, are the caterers for the evening:

the "Star" in her chamber, the "Stock" in the green room, the "supernumeraries" lying about in their sphere of misery and contempt, the "property man" with his thousand petty troubles, and the "manager" with an equal number, of greater importance. We cannot hear any of the petty difficulties which set Damon and Pythias at fisticuffs, or create a coldness between Juliet and her Romeo. We cannot pause to mark the patronizing way in which Mr. third-rate speaks to Mr. fourth-rate, or the half disguised contempt with which Mr. second-rate looks down on both; to note the still lower grade of estimation in which they all hold the ballet dancer and the supernumeraries, or the cool way in which Mr. Star cuts the whole of them, and sometimes takes mean little advantages of them while on the stage. All this we cannot see, as indicative of the artificial, and often vicious society behind the scenes, and we therefore confine our attention to the spectators. We have time, before the curtain rises, to note the variety. Where shall we begin? Above, or below? Suppose we take the latter; for here a gentleman can venture without loss of character; though the majority in the pit are not at all to his taste. He has a good view of the stage; his satisfaction, however, being interfered with by the impatience of those around, to get through the tragedy, so that they may enjoy the obscene fun and double entendres of the farce; or by the coarse gusto with which they discuss the lower extremities of the flimsily arrayed dancers. Just above this group of the pit, we see the elite of the audience, the refined, the intellectual, the sentimental, the godless; for though the serious christian may be there, by enticement, he soon feels that it is not his place, nor is his visit repeated. Church members are there in abundance, perhaps. But they are the same who are to be found in all other scenes of worldliness and folly; who have neither the world's respect nor the church's confidence. Above we see the second tier, rather more miscellaneous and doubtful: its inhabitants making occasional forays, during the dance, into the pit, or to the story above: this and the upper story each having a bar for all purposes of genteel stimulation, with police to take care that this common privilege to all the male spectators be not abused.

Shall we go any further in our upward course? We dare not. Nor can any one who would tell the whole truth, hope to find admission to the pages of any respectable publication. Let it suffice to say that there are the daughters of shame,

and that they are not alone. That the gambler, the bully, the Roué are there also; and, worse than all, that the half-grown youth of sixteen and eighteen, often there begins the career which ends in licentiousness and crime. Our author-ess wisely passes by this ulcer, with the remark that a woman cannot discuss it. Neither can a man, who has any regard for the purity of his own mind, or that of his readers.

But our reflections are broken in upon, by a pause in the music. The curtain rises. Our neighbor lends us a bill and we find for the evening, but slight entertainment, even for "the mere intellect." We note with some curiosity the *dramatis personæ*; and are arrested by the appearance of the principal character. It is a female. She is beautiful, marvellously so.

"Quanto splendidior, quam cætera sidera, fulget
Lucifer, et quanto, te Lucifer, aurea Phœbe
Tanto virginibus præstantior omnibus Herse
Ibat, eratque decus pompæ, comitumque suarum."

We have been arrested by that same face of almost angelic loveliness, as hung out at the fruit shops, for public admiration; and have wondered where could be the original. That original we now see, with her proper name; and we begin to understand why there are so many less of one sex, and so many more of another, in the genteel boxes. Who is she? Of her real name, we have no definite information; but that by which she is known has rung with infamy through two continents. And this discarded mistress of one of the ten acre sovereigns of Europe, and the divorced wife of one or two, or perhaps three other men, has called together this audience, not to see good acting, for to this she makes little pretension, but simply to see herself, and this call they have obeyed with alacrity! Heart sick and disgusted, we turn from this school, where no morals are to be learned, but those which are foul, and debasing, and loathsome; amazed to see the fathers, and husbands, and brothers of virtuous women in such a place, and to hear them speak of it afterwards with profound indifference!

"But this," some one will say, "is an abuse." It is an abuse, like that of the third tier, and the bar rooms, which if taken away, will destroy their use; for the attraction which draws will, to a great extent, be taken away also. But glancing over this plea, and the reply to it alike, we will imagine ourselves in the same position, with somewhat more of a feminine audience around us, as the curtain rises, for a very

different performance, upon those same boards, and by a very different personage. Here, as on the previous occasion, the cynosure of all eyes is a female; possessing no less loveliness than "the woman of Samaria," of whom we have been speaking above. Even there, and while standing upon those boards, polluted as they were, by such contact and association as that which we have lately witnessed, we look upon her with profound respect. She is the daughter of one American gentleman, the wife of another. She is there, with the approval of both; and actuated by the noble resolution to retrieve the fortunes of a beloved protector: nor has the tongue of slander dared to utter aught to her detraction. And this lady, we would not venture to say it but upon her own authority, personates Mrs. Haller, for the evening. Strange professional fascination, which can induce her to personate such a character, to put forth her own exquisite powers for the production of such sympathy in behalf of a penitent as hides from the vast majority of minds the nature of the sin of which she has been guilty, the moral disapproval of which it should be productive. The play goes on. The audience are convulsed. There is so little suffering in actual life, and so few real Mrs. Hallers' overhead to claim their sympathy and be really benefited by it, that they are completely overcome with delicious emotion. Most, even the performers are completely absorbed. And if there be one in the audience, who in the tumult of his own emotion, can think of them as actors, he is surprised at the depth of real feeling which they exhibit. But not so with all. One of the performers has told us better. Mr. Stranger, who has a faculty of cracking dry jokes, without the quivering of a muscle, in the most professionally distressing scenes, has just exploded a squib at the lugubrious appearance of the audience. And Mrs. Haller, forgetful alike of her children, her sorrows, and her penitence, forces a handkerchief in her mouth, to prevent the audience from seeing that she is laughing at them! Such is the Drama. Its best is but a sham on one side, and the cold-blooded selfishness of mere sensibility and sentimentalism on the other. Its worst, and what seems ingrained into the very system, as we have said above, no man dare describe.

We have thus seen the thing.* We will now look at the

* If it be objected that this is not a fair exhibition of the usual run of dramatic exhibition, our reply is twofold: first, the objection is not founded in fact; secondly, if it were, the occasional representation of such plays would indicate the essential morals of the theatre. We do not confine the term immorality to breach of the seventh commandment.

argument in its favor. This we believe will do mischief. It may induce some, with far less preparation and capability of resistance than our authoress, to tread with unpractised feet a path peculiarly beset with temptation: too often the inclined and slippery plane of theatrical exhibition which ends in ruin. And it may tempt many others to frequent theatres, who have doubted the propriety of so doing. Had Mrs. Butler written a book in defence of the stage, it would have had comparatively little effect. It was an inheritance to which she was born. The majesty, the elevation, the grace and purity of a Siddons had fallen as a mantle upon her shoulders. She belonged to a *caste*. But we are startled when a lady, an American woman with all the influences of religious and moral instruction, comes out from the sweet sanctities of home, to exhibit her gifts in support of an Institution which has ever been deemed of a questionable character; which has ever been deemed by the religious world unfriendly to the best interests of virtue. "All must admit," says John Foster, "with ordinary moral perceptions, the depravity of the theatre in the collective character of its constituents, the plays, the players, and a large portion of the spectators." The argument as we understand it, is to show that this instinct of the religious world, which is stronger than a logical demonstration, is wrong. And that in spite of these evils, many of them frankly admitted, the Drama, if not positively good, is not essentially bad; and may, therefore, be purified and encouraged by all classes.

First, we are told that the theatre is capable of being made an engine to promote the cause of virtue. Has it ever been so? Does its general tendency encourage any such anticipation? We suppose the experience of ages has settled this question. It is well known that the most sublime and elevating truth loses its power when uttered by those who do not exemplify it in their lives. Admitting, for the sake of argu-

Murder, revenge, suicide, and the other host of evil deeds often extenuated and glorified on the stage, come under this same designation. Revenge and suicide especially, find in theatrical exhibitions their strongest incitements. It would be hard to find a tragedy in which these two vices are not enrolled. Mrs. Mowatt in her argument tells us that the play, "Bertram," a favorite with many great actors, and now constantly performed, was written by a clergyman. If the reader be curious to see how vile a play a clergyman can write, we can refer him to a criticism upon this, of Rev. Mr. Maturin's, in the twenty-third chapter of Coleridge's *Biographia Literaria*. The taste and morals correspond. And they are, alike, infinitely and ludicrously atrocious and disgusting.

ment, that the Drama has been usually on the side of virtue, what has been the prevailing character of the *Dramatis Personae*? The unsettled mode of life, the late hours, the intimate and exceptionable relations that men and women bear to each other on the stage, and more than all, perhaps, the low estimate in which they have been held by society, has reacted upon them, making them more reckless than the necessary tendencies of their position would have done. The theatre, of course, has in the lapse of centuries had lustre shed upon it by genius and virtue. We are reminded, for instance, of Mr. Garrick. His untainted morals in a situation exposed to temptation, his amiable domestic behavior, his generosity and fidelity to his relations, his charity to the poor and distressed, will be remembered by the age in which he lived, and recorded to ages to come. The greatest Poet of any age, has chosen this form of composition to embody his conceptions of the good, the beautiful, and the true. Yet the surpassing genius of Shakspeare, the occasional appearance of such stars, few and far between, as a Garrick, a Siddons or a Mrs. Mowatt, cannot dispel the cloud of obloquy that has ever hung over the theatre in the eyes of the moral and religious. The theatre, from the time of Aristophanes to the present day, has reeked with the fumes of dissipation, debauchery and riot. Its hue has varied somewhat with the morality and refinement of the age. But it has been the creature of public sentiment, and not the creator of it; when vice and iniquity have unblushingly stalked abroad, it has been their mouth-piece; and the ready panderer to make bad worse. Witness the dramas of the seventeenth century, when the cause of morality and virtue were bleeding from the shameless profligacy of King and court. "This part of our literature," says Macaulay, "is a disgrace to our language and to our national character. It is clever indeed, and entertaining, but is, in the most emphatic sense of the word, 'earthly, sensual, devilish.'" Dryden defended or excused his offences and those of his contemporaries, by pleading the example of the *earlier* English dramatists." The crime charged is not coarseness of expression, for this varies with the taste of the age, but it is the serious crime of presenting what is immoral to the imagination of the young and susceptible, in connection with what is attractive. We have said that from the reign of Charles II. to the reign of George II., the English drama was in a high degree impure and immoral, and this too, was *the age* of the best British classics. There are a

few exceptions to this category. Milton and Addison have adopted this form of composition as a vehicle of pure and refined sentiment. But as in Addison's *Cato*, or Shakspeare's *Othello*, they are uttered by the suicide, the profligate, or the revengeful murderer, and a sympathy is created in their favor, which leads to an extenuation of their evil deeds. Corneille and Racine have even made use of Christian subjects in some of their best tragedies, though one of these regretted his work in after life. And it is well known that plays of this class have never been favorites with the theatre. The majority of theatre-goers have ever been the frivolous, profane and profligate, with tastes utterly uncongenial with the purer and sublimer effusions of the tragic muse. If we go back to the drama of Ancient Greece, we shall find that the comedies, at least, were full of gross obscenity, and that the wit of the actors was not unfrequently made use of to defame and ridicule the best citizens of Athens. In the Augustan age actors and actresses were a despised class. And the christian church has ever been hostile to the theatre, with the exception of a short period during the middle ages. Dean Milman, in his history of Christianity, when speaking of the hostility of the church to theatres, and other public spectacles, and their consequent decline, says: "In all European countries, the christian mystery has been the parent of tragedy. It reappeared as a purely religious representation, and was at one period, *perhaps*, the most effective teacher in times of general ignorance and scarcity of books, both among priest and people, of christian history as well as christian legend." "But at a later period, the old hereditary hostility to christianity has constantly revived." For the allaying of which hostility, we suppose, this writer has himself written one or two plays, which have about as much of the christian mysteries or christianity in them, as is to be found in the *Prometheus Vincetus*, or the *Œdipus Tyrannus*! We have italicized the word *perhaps*, in this quotation, for the purpose of calling attention to the inference hazarded by the author. With due deference to his authority, we receive his facts, and question the correctness of his inference. And this, not only on the general principles which control the movements of human nature, but in view of certain facts connected with these religious theatricals. Prior to all experience, we should be slow to conceive that the extreme familiarity with which the actors in such case would handle the most sacred subjects, and the critical state of mind natural to the spectator, of anything

known to be only a performance, could add much to the reverence and religion of the people, even if it increased their knowledge. And the facts of the case show that such anticipation is well founded. These plays were introduced by the Pilgrims when they returned from Palestine. And they are continued, in a modified form, by those who visit there at the present time. "The history and death of our Savior was one of the subjects chosen for representation. So great became the rage of the people for such performances, that the priests were obliged to hold service at an earlier hour, on Sunday, that the people might have time to attend both the church and the theatre. But the exhibitions were not confined to the Monks, nor to the representation of sacred subjects. And a change and separation in these matters gradually occurred. The dramatic exhibitions of sacred scenes by the priests, took place, as it now does, grossly in Mexico and South America, with great taste and refinement, in France and Italy—in the morning, and the dramatic exhibitions by the actors, of other subjects, as they now do, in those same countries, took place in the evening. And we need hardly say, to any intelligent reader, with what effect upon the religion and morals of a community. The drama has been tried and tested by a variety of experiments, and through a long series of years, with always the same general result. Even when it has been enlisted, not in the cause of mere pleasure, intellectual or sensual, but in that of religion, this same result has been gradually elaborated. Let any one bear in mind the Sunday morning religious theatricals, at High Mass in the Parisian Cathedrals, and those in the evening of an irreligious character, at the theatre, with the same audience present on both occasions, and then remember what are the capabilities of that population for everything mischievous, and he will behold the results of this trial in full development. Judging the tree by its fruits, he will know what to think of our authoress's and Mary Howitt's assertion: "That they consider the stage as capable of becoming one of the great means of human advancement and improvement."

Not less inconclusive is the argument derived from the personal experience of our authoress, the effect produced upon her mind, upon the first sight of the stage. At fourteen she tells us she was taken for the first time to the theatre. Up to this time she had believed, under the teachings of her pastor, that it was the favorite abode of sin and wickedness. She saw Fanny Kemble, and all her prejudices melted into

thin air. The extent and depth of these prejudices may be judged, when the reader remembers that she was devoted to private theatricals, was anxious to see Fanny Kemble "*just once*," and could not attend to her studies the day previous to this first visit to the theatre, in thinking of what she was about to enjoy! When to this is added the confident assumption that her pastor, a man of integrity and experience, merely "*supposed*" he knew what he asserted, we can hardly conceive a more favorable or thorough preparation for the laying aside of these prejudices. How would it have been, could she have been taken that first night, behind the scenes, and through the whole building? There would have been no necessity for the request "to have the goodness to point out the harm." And it would have been seen that Dr. E. spoke upon something more solid than what he merely "*supposed*." But leaving out the idea, and the effect of such exploration, and confining our view simply to the performance itself, it should be remembered that prejudices do not always thus instantaneously vanish at the sight of a theatrical performance; that this very sight sometimes creates them. "When taken by a parent," says a female friend, who has read this autobiography, "when taken by a parent, at about the same age, to the theatre to see the greatest actor of the day, every feeling of reverence was shocked, not so much by the profane expressions as by the prayers and addresses to the Deity. These which when read, seemed to give point and significance, now, when uttered by the impassioned actor, thrilled the religious sense with horror, and seemed to demand a genuine prayer for forgiveness in being found in such a place." And yet we have no doubt that had this lady been seasoned by a previous course of private theatricals, this natural shock of her religious nature would not at all have been experienced. The amount of the authoress's information and argument is simply this: that from childhood she has been fascinated by a certain form of amusement. Nobody, however, denies this its fascinating and absorbing character. It has the power to steep the conscience in forgetfulness of every duty, and hold spell-bound the intellect. All classes catch the infection. The artisan deserts his work, the merchant his trade, the servant follows his master. But the same may be said of gaming, and of many other ruinous vices. And the fascinating excitement may be just as artificial, unhealthy and ruinous.

But we are told that many good men and women, and pious clergy have contributed, by their writings, to the drama.—

doubtless they have. And, with sorrow be it said, they have done many other inconsistent things. And the same result has followed from this, in some instances well meant, but ill judged attempt to do good by means of theatrical exhibitions. Pious clergymen and laymen have written plays, that they might be substituted for those of questionable character, of which the authoress speaks, and in which she has taken part. But how did they succeed? Every theatre-goer knows. The plays of Hannah More, and Dr. Young, and Mrs. Hemans, and Coleridge, and many others of the same class, are *read*, perhaps. Bertram, and the Stranger, and Jane Shore, and the Lady of Lyons, with coarser after pieces to correspond, are *played*. Even though political feeling may sustain a play, from one of this first class of writers, as was the case with Addison's Cato, when it came out, or though it may be galvanized into life for a brief interval, by a great artistic performer, as was this by Vanderhoff, yet, at all other times, it is dead and worthless, for all the purposes of successful exhibition. Such plays "don't pay." And if they did, the matter would not be much mended. Even these writers seem to have felt that there is a sort of pabulum in genuine christianity, which the theatre-going population would not either take in or assimilate. As a general thing, their staple morality never rises above the common places of heathenism; and the finale almost always involves an apotheosis of some one of its vices, suicide, murder, or something equally bad. And if it be said that it would be absurd to represent Cato, dying like Richard Baxter or Robert Leighton, we reply, very true. But why represent the former at all, and ignore the latter? Except it be, as we assert, and as these writers perfectly understand, that the heathen death scene of a Cato would, if well done, be looked upon with sympathy and delight, by an immense and profitable audience, while that of a christian Baxter or Leighton, however well played, would have no one but the performers to witness it. To purify the theatre, the audience must be purified. But this audience, if even purified by some other process, to an appreciation of genuine, earnest christianity, will turn from theatrical artificialities, with profound indifference. And this, even if there were nothing in them of a positive character to give offence. "When I became a man," says the great Apostle, "I put away childish things."

Again, as to the allegation that St. Paul quoted from certain dramatic poets, and that neither he nor our Lord ever in

express terms, called attention to the theatre, as immoral. Which allegation, if it really proves anything, would show that the gladiatorial shows, and contests of strength in the various games, are of a like harmless and laudable character. Would any one infer from the fact of an illustrative exhortation based upon the figure of a race, that foot-races were sanctioned? Or that because gaming, and the bloody combats of the Amphitheatre are not mentioned by name, they are then not blamable? The fact is, the sacred writers do not concern themselves with any of the peculiar Institutions, as such, existing then in human society. Their work was to lay broad and deep the foundations of pure christian morality, for the individual; to teach a set of doctrines, which if adopted throughout the world, would destroy every form of vice. They laid the axe to the root of the tree; the corrupt fruit, in the form of any particular vicious institution, must needs perish with it. If it be remembered, moreover, how intimately theatrical representations were associated with gross vice, and some of the foulest pollutions of heathenism, it will be seen that to denounce one, was to denounce the other. "The more ascetic christians," says Milman, "condemned alike all the popular spectacles. From their avowed connection with Paganism, and with the worship of the Pagan Deities, according to the accredited notion that all these deities were permitted to delude mankind, the theatre was regarded as a kind of temple of the evil spirit. The profession was considered infamous, and the indecency of attire upon the public stage, justified the low estimate of the moral character of the actors." This quotation will show the value of the argument, in favor of this institution, drawn from primitive sentiment, or apostolic silence, as to its particular culpability or innocence. The argument from the plays of Gregory Nazianzen, which it seems were never acted, and not written with the intention of their being thus used, we have anticipated in our remarks on the sacred dramas of the middle ages. "Some have supposed," says a learned writer, "that the tragedies written on religious subjects, in the time of Julian, were represented upon the stage. There is no ground for this opinion. They were intended as school books, to supply the place of Sophocles and Menander."

Perhaps the most forcible, in appearance, but the most unsatisfactory, in reality, is that portion of Mrs. Mowatt's argument, which consists of quotations from the writings of

various great and good men, as to the possible tendencies and effects of theatrical amusements. It is manifest from these quotations, that these writers contemplate a state of things which has never existed; and which, with the ordinary tendencies of depraved human nature, can never be reasonably anticipated. Many of these sentiments were doubtless uttered in view of the works of the great Masters, stripped of demoralizing adjuncts, and are perfectly consistent with decided opposition to the theatre, as it now is, and ever has been. When we discuss a particular institution, we must first look at that institution, as existing, with its general tendencies, as manifested by past experience: not merely or mainly at some ideal, which lies in some remote region of possibility. And even that ideal, which may be bodied forth by the most sober intellect, must have regard to the agents by whom it will be realized: not demand the capacities and tendencies of creatures of pure reason and supreme conscience, as angels and archangels, but those of fallen men and women. And the all-sufficient reply to these assertions, as to what the drama, as acted, *may do*, is to ask what *has it done?* *what is it doing?* We know very well that certain States, in ancient and modern times, have recognized the theatré as a school of morals; and we know, too, what kind of morals they have been taught by it. Nor could anything better have been anticipated. How could the State expect to be purified, and instructed by a class, which public sentiment, justly or unjustly, regarded as disreputable? We suppose the reply to this will be, that it was the noble or elevating sentiment, not the man who was to utter it, which they had in view; a reply which shows about as profound ignorance of human nature, as can well be imagined.

The musical words and fluent sentences of the following extract, have doubtless had their effect upon more than one inexperienced reader: "Art is either right or wrong. The sanctioning voices of ages have pronounced it to be right.—One branch of art includes the Drama. Shall this branch be lopped off because the canker worm of evil has entered some of its fruit? Like sculpture, like painting, like music, like the poem, the novel, the drama is an instrument either of good or evil, as it is rendered the one or the other by the use or abuse. This is the veriest truism. The theatre, like the press, is one of the most powerful organs for the diffusion of salutary, or pernicious influences. Vicious books have been written, shall we, therefore, extirpate the press? Plays of

questionable morality have been enacted; but is that a cause for abolishing the stage, sacrificing, for the present abuse, the great and permanent use?" &c., &c. Now in all this there are two assumptions. First, that the acted drama does constitute a proper sphere of christian art; for it is to christians that the argument is addressed. The true christian actor exhibits the graces of the gospel in his daily conduct, and for their own sake, not putting them on on special occasions, and for the pleasure or amusement of others. There is yet to be a great adjustment between christianity and the heathenish and polluting art, by which society is now so much corrupted. The Sydenham correspondence, within the last few months, and the exhibition of the *Modele Artistes*, some few years ago, in this country, will help to explain our allusion. The other assumption here made, and it is the assumption of the whole book, is that there is a *great and permanent use of the theatre*. Whereas, in point of fact, it has even in itself proved an abuse. And this, too, in spite of the legislation which has protected it, and the good men who have written for it, and have anticipated so much from its influences. Upon the authoress's own showing, and from her many quotations, it is manifest that it has wanted neither sanction, protection, nor good wishes, to afford it a fair trial. But where have the great and permanent uses appeared? Where have not the abuses gone up to heaven, in their rankness and enormity, when any such trial has been made for any considerable length of time. The class to whom this argument is addressed, do not admit the premise upon which it is based. Who ever thought of arguing against the use of a necessary thing from its abuse? The consuming flames commit fearful ravages; shall the element from which they arise, therefore, be excluded from our habitations? In the sea lies many a precious and buried thing; shall we therefore despise it as a means of communication? Some few lunatics commit suicide; shall therefore the rest of mankind go handcuffed? In this world there is nothing unmixed with evil. The trail of the serpent has passed over every earthly thing. Yet for all this, there are some things which have necessary uses, among which the theatre is not numbered. And there are certain other things which, if not in our abstract ideal of them, yet in their concrete existence are always full of abuse, are, so to speak, themselves an abuse of time, energy and human labor; and among these is the acted drama.

And this brings us to the very gist of the argument, upon this subject. One of which our authoress seems to have no conception. Thus far, we have confined ourselves to the theatre, as it is, and as it has been, in reply to an argument, to the serious christian, to subject himself and his family, to its innumerable evils, that by his and their influence it may be purified and made a school of virtue and morality. Upon this argument alone, the probabilities are infinite that such an experiment, if made, would eat out the vital heart of evangelical christianity, in a quarter of a century. This would be abstaining "from all appearance of evil," and "having no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness," with a vengeance. The drama would doubtless flourish, as it now does in Berlin, in Paris, and in Vienna. But vital religion would either be extinguished, or driven out into the most unfrequented walks of human society. We do not, however, choose to stop with these facts, conclusive as they may be, in answer to this and similar appeals. When we see certain facts reproducing certain other facts, and this, too, in successive periods, and in different communities, we naturally infer that there is a causal connection. We do not get rid of this invariable tendency by calling it an abuse. The question will recur, why does this abuse, as you call it, so invariably appear, and so overwhelmingly predominate? Is there not something essentially vicious in the first set of facts by which these others are produced? We believe that this question, as applicable to the acted drama, is properly answered in the affirmative. Leaving altogether out of sight, for the present, the theatre as it is, there are certain things which will ever render it unfit to be an aid to the moralist; which will render it detrimental to the general health of human society. Some of these we shall briefly indicate.

One of the first of these is the very position which the actor occupies. He may regard himself as the teacher, but his audience regard him as the caterer for their pleasure; whatever may be the nature of that pleasure, whether gross or refined. If he does well, he is applauded; if not, he is hissed, and driven from the stage. The audience are in a critical state. They have the legal right to be so, and this right is exercised in a most merciless, and often brutal manner: the actor being regarded, in the large majority of cases, as one of a caste, not current except rarely, and by very special license, in general society. How can any one, who knows human nature, anticipate that when hearer and speaker

occupy these respective positions, the hearer will receive any real instruction from what is said? that he will be benefitted by such instruction? How would it be, how is it in fact, when speaker and hearer occupy, to each other, the same relative position, in a very different place, the house, not of amusement, but of public worship? The christian minister, we will say, and his congregation, come together just as actor and audience. It is a fine, wealthy, and intellectual body of hearers. The arrangements for comfort are exquisite. The speaker is well paid; for that congregation will not put up with anything ordinary or commonplace. He is a refined gentleman, in his intercourse with his charge; nor has he ever shocked an individual hearer by vulgar allusions to the subject of personal religion. His voice, manner, and elocution are unexceptionable. And there is a grace and brevity about his discourses that while away every sensation of weariness. "It is the best prayer that was ever made to a Boston audience." And one of the most gracefully delivered discourses of that same performer. The building overflows weekly. And the additions, in point of number and respectability, are of a most gratifying character. But who expects souls to be converted under such process? The doctrine may be orthodox, sound, complete, the eloquence of the highest order. It whiles away the half hour pleasantly, and it passes criticism. And that is the end of it. And why is this? Simply because he and his people have made the church a theatre, and the pulpit a stage. He is not recognized as the ambassador of the King of kings, he does not stand forward in the majesty of his commission. And the result corresponds. *Ex nihilo nihil fit*. And if the very life-giving truths of inspiration, are thus stripped of their power, when presented under such circumstances; when the preacher is the actor, and the hearer a mere critic or intellectual epicure, seeking pleasure, what can be expected from the mere vapid moralities—we are assuming that there are no immoralities—of the theatre? The moral or religious teacher must, first of all, be respected. And the truth which strikes, must come, and be regarded as coming, from his own heart. Without these prerequisites he can amuse, and interest, and startle, and electrify. But it is the effect of the moment. He will never convert, elevate and purify. The question is asked: "does the mere translation of the parable—the prodigal son, for instance—into represented action, render it pernicious?" We answer yes; for the parable would then become perfectly worthless, for all the

purposes for which it was given. It would be converting high moral truth into mere amusement. Human nature is so constituted, that the mere theatrical reading of that parable, understood to be such, would be perfectly destructive, for the time being, to the hearer, of its moral vitality.

Now this would be the case, even if the plays were every thing that could be desired. Supposing these plays to be destitute of all positively immoral tendency, to be like some of Johnson's and Hannah More's, strictly moral as to their tone and teachings, to be not merely moral, but in the true sense of the word, christian, at the same time free from all of that morbid and unhealthy sentimentalism by which the modern drama is pervaded; suppose, additionally, that the actors were men of known purity of character, and the audience corresponded, even then but little could be anticipated from the theatre, as a school of morals. We cannot, if we would, think of certain individuals, as our equals, or look up to them with those feelings which open the mind for the reception of moral influences. That respectable individual, whose services in the bath-room contributed so much to our comfort, that other one whose well sharpened razors we so much enjoy, that other one upon whom we depend for a supply of Day and Martin upon our pedal coverings, that other one who amuses or interests us upon the stage, and that other one whose admirable discourse was so well delivered, each and all of them, as ministers of our pleasure, and as understood so to be, may claim our kindly and patronizing feelings. But they have voluntarily assumed a position which, while held, unfits them for another: that of associates, of guides or moral instructors. It would be quite as easy for a man to associate with his barber, or boot-black, as equals, as it would be to receive a moral lesson from the actor whom he pays to amuse him, or a religious one from the clergyman whose services are looked upon as rendered under the same conditions. Purify the theatre, therefore, purify the actors, and purify the audience, and yet this relative position of actor and audience will ever neutralize the moral influence of any practical truth which he may utter in their hearing. But this is not all. There would be, additionally, a positively mischievous effect produced, even under this most favorable supposition. Let any one habituate himself to hear high moral or religious truth in an improper state of mind, merely to be amused or interested by it, under any other circumstances than those which command his respect, and induce his action, and that

man will be positively injured. Truth cannot be dissociated from profound respect in its reception, and from practical effect in its application, without being productive of mischief; it either gives rise to action, or it destroys the moral capability to action! The stage dissociates the truth from each of these, its natural correlatives. And in so doing, strips it of all its power for good, and makes it an instrument of evil. It is, in this respect, as in those appeals which are sometimes made to our mere sensibilities. Every one has heard of the sentimental moralist who wept over a dead brute by the road side, while his aged and neglected mother was pining in an alms house. Many a novel reader and play goer have shed delicious tears over the imaginary sorrows of the afflicted and desolate, who if disturbed in the midst of their emotions, by an appeal from the real object, would turn away from it in disgust, if not in positive indignation. We are persuaded that the nearest approach to a perfect incarnation of selfishness, may be found in some of the young females of our country, whose natural sensibilities have been subjected to this process of induration. And exactly the same law operates to the production of exactly the same effect, when we pass out of the region of the sensibilities into those of conscience and moral determination.

We have thus—upon the supposition that the theatre could be made all that Mrs. Mowatt desires it, which it never can—seen its inefficiency for good, and its tendency for evil. Without stopping to expose the folly of curing the radical cancer of human nature, by these substituted moralities of heathenism for christian truth, we shall close by noticing one other evil developed by these amusements, and inseparably connected with their existence. They must be of a startling, exciting character. The accomplished tragic actor, we will say, holds the mirror up to nature. But it is nature amidst the tumultuous convulsion of the storm, the whirlwind, or the volcano. The same exaggeration must give charm to the broadness of the farce, or the piquant sauce of the genteel comedy. Let any one glance over a volume of the modern plays, most favorably received by the public, such for instance as *Virginus*, *Fazio*, *Evadne*, the *Hunchback*, *Bertram*—which last, as we have seen, is abominable on other grounds—or the *Lady of Lyons*, and he will see the correctness of the remark just made. But can one rightly live in such an overcharged and excited atmosphere, and not be debilitated? Even if the constituents to such excitement were always un-

objectionable, the effect would be mental debility and dissipation. But this is by no means the fact. The materials to the production of such excitement are not always pure and healthy. The human mind, in its morbid and unhealthy action, and with all the distortions of hatred, of jealousy and revenge, is constantly help up for inspection. The spectator passes out of the sphere of common life, with its commonplace, yet all important duties. Under the habitual intoxication of the stage, life's sober realities become tedious and disgusting. This effect frequently being as powerful in the case of the actor as with the spectator. The writer, with whose book we have been occupied, announces her intention to quit the stage, and since then her farewell has been formally uttered. We will not prophesy; for private theatricals, and the admiration of select circles of amateurs may satisfy the craving of an artificially excited and ever increasing appetite. But we doubt it; and should not at any moment be surprised to hear that she had again entered upon the arena of her former triumphs. Like the excitement of the ball-room, the novel, or any other artificial source of gratification, it renders its votary, to a certain extent, disqualified for every thing else. And when these excitements are sought, merely as pleasure and amusement, and only regarded in that aspect, they not only debilitate for good, but render susceptible to evil. To be "lovers of pleasure," as such is to be "not lovers of God." The selfishness and self-indulgence, fostered and strengthened under the first of these affections, is naturally expulsive of the other.

And now let the christian reader combine these evil tendencies of the theatre, as Mrs. Mowatt would have it, with those of the theatre, as it really is, and he will see the utter worthlessness of her argument in its defence; the hopelessness of all attempts to convert it into a school of pure christian morality. Heathen and christian moralists and legislators have made the attempt, again and again. As the quotations of this book show, they have confidently asserted that it could be done. Their attempts have failed. Their assertions have been falsified. The theatre is still as it ever has been, the home and haunt of those who are lovers of pleasure, rather than lovers of God. The frivolous, the vicious, the godless voluptuary, whether in the sphere of sense or of intellect, find within its walls their respective gratifications. And so it ever will be. Men will never be purified by merely hearing virtuous sentiments, or by seeing nothing more than

a known imitation of virtuous actions. While on the other hand, the evil tendencies of human nature, assimilate every thing evil, in such scenes, and are heightened by them to ten thousand fold intensity.

ARTICLE VI.

Horae Germanicae: A version of German Hymns. By Henry Mills. Second edition, revised and enlarged. New York and Auburn: Miller, Orton & Mulligan.—1856.

We take much shame to ourselves for not having much more promptly noticed this second edition of Dr. Mills' translations of German hymns. We owe Dr. Mills, and we owe the public an apology for our long silence in regard to it, which we herewith tender in the shape of a more careful notice than we could have given at any earlier day. To the first edition of Dr. Mills' work, we have frequently referred in the Review, and we have, therefore, very little to add here, except that we think the book greatly improved, and increased in value, by the forty new translations which have been added to it, making the whole number of hymns which the book now contains, one hundred and seventy-two, besides sixty-one doxologies. This is one of the most important contributions that has ever been made to this department of our literature, containing as it does, specimens of the hymns of nearly all our standard German writers of this class. We have only to regret that Dr. Mills has not confined himself more exclusively to our standard writers, whose productions must still, for a long time to come, form the staple of our church hymns, which we are more particularly anxious to see transferred into a suitable English form. Some of the writers whom he here presents, are almost unknown to our collections of hymns, as for instance, Weissenborn, Jürgens, and some others. But, on the other hand, he has here added quite a number of our very best hymns—hymns that can never grow old whilst there is a christian pulsation to swell the heart with prayer, or to enrapture it with praise. Among these are Gellert's "*Gott ist mein Lied:*" Luther's "*Nun freut euch lieben Christen G'mein,*" "*Komm Heiliger Geist, o Herre Gott,*" and vari-

ous others; Rothe's "*Ich habe nun den Grund gefunden*;" Heerberger's "*Valet will ich dir geben*;" Gustavus Adolphus' "*Verzage nicht, o Hauslein Klein*;" Paul Gerhardt's "*Befiel du deine Wege*;" Matthesius' "*Aus meines Herzensgrunde*;" Franke's "*Gottlob ein Schritt zur Ewigkeit*," and some others.

The style does not differ materially from that by which Dr. Mills' earlier efforts are distinguished. He very successfully reproduces the metre of the original—all of them can be sung to the original melodies, and thus present a source of heartfelt enjoyment to those who have hung with rapture upon the church tunes of our German fathers, but are less familiar with the language of the original than with English. But there is often a harshness in the construction of sentences, which by no means suits the simple genius of the English, and that easy flow of versification to which its limited metrical forms have accustomed us. His rhymes also are sometimes false and harsh, and far from satisfying the cultivated ear, although rather superior in this respect to most of our English writers of hymns anterior to Montgomery. We give as a favorable specimen of these new versions, the rendering of Herberger's "*Valet will ich dir geben*," cordially commending the whole collection to the attention of our readers.

THE WORLD RENOUNCED.

1 Vain world, forbear thy pleading!

I bid the now—adieu!

Thy course to ruin leading,

No longer I pursue,

In heav'n is bliss forever,—

My wishes thither go;

There God will crown with favor

Who love him here below.

2 With counsel now supply me,

Dear Savior, lest I stray;

If sorrows here must try me,

On thee my courage stay!

From pangs protracted, spare me,

And soothe my throbbing heart!

By sight of bliss prepare me,

Then bid in peace depart!

3 If danger cloud my spirit,

Let thy dear cross but shine,

I will no longer fear it,
 But ev'ry care resign :
 Nor will I shrink to suffer,
 If then my faith may see
 The victim thou didst offer,
 In dying, Lord, for me.

4 My soul is feeble—hide it
 From all that would annoy !
 Through vales of darkness, guide it
 To realms of light and joy !
 His way is safe from error,
 Who learns from thee the road ;
 His soul need feel no terror,
 Whose refuge is in God.

5 Show me my name recorded
 Within thy book of life,
 My lot by grace awarded
 With victors in the strife !
 Their joys in song are flowing—
 And when I rise above,
 My heart with transport glowing,
 I, too, will sing thy love.

ARTICLE VII.

Lyra Germanica. Hymns for the Sundays and chief Festivals of the Christian Year. Translated from the German of Catharine Winkworth. New York : Thomas N. Stanford, 637 Broadway.—1856.

Here, too, we are slow in performing our duty. We ought to have been much more prompt in directing the attention of our readers to such a work as that before us. It is certainly one of the most genial and readable translations with which we are acquainted. With the exception of Pope's Homer, we know of no translation of a poetical composition, that so well preserves the spirit of the original, and presents it in such genuine English. Here are over a hundred of our most delightful German hymns, given in an English dress, that affords the same pleasure that we experience in the perusal of

their originals—Luther, Paul Eber, Rist, Paul Gerhardt, Johann Franck, Scheffler, Tersteegen, Schmolck, Neumark, von Canitz, and many others, are here reproduced in a style that only lacks one thing to make the same impression upon the soul that is conveyed by the exquisite original.

That one thing is the metre, in regard to which we are compelled to differ entirely from the accomplished authoress. Her reason for not retaining the metres of the original, is the following: "In translating these hymns, the original form has been retained, with the exception, that single rhymes are almost invariably substituted for the double rhymes which the structure of the language renders so common in German poetry, but which become cloying to an English ear, when often repeated; and that English double common, or short metre, is used instead of what may be called the German common metre, the same that we call Gay's stanza, which is scarcely solemn enough for sacred purposes. In a few instances, slight alterations have been made in the metre, when, as is the case with some excellent hymns in our own language, it is hardly grave and dignified enough for the poetry."

Now we readily admit that the double rhyme is not so natural to the English language as it is to the German, but we have no evidence that it is offensive to the English ear. On the contrary, we believe that many of our most popular hymns are composed in double rhymes, as, for instance, Heber's "Missionary Hymn," "From Greenland's icy mountains," "Come, thou fount of ev'ry blessing," "Lord, dismiss us with thy blessing," and many others. But we should not notice this on the present occasion, were we able to understand our authoress when she says that, with this exception, she has retained the metre of the original! Her first piece, for instance, is a version of Richter's "*Hüter! wird die Nacht der Sünden,*" of which her first stanza is as follows:

"O watchman, will the night of sin
Be never past?
O watchman, doth the day begin
To dawn upon thy straining sight at last?
Will it dispel
Ere long the mists of sense wherein I dwell?"

This translation is very fine, giving the spirit and sense of the original with great fidelity. But the metre is entirely different, not only from the absence of the double rhyme, but by the substitution of the iambic for the trochaic metre. Some

lines also have more and some fewer syllables than the original, to which we certainly cannot trace the slightest resemblance in metre. In others there is a nearer approach to the metre of the original, and we are only surprised that it was not made to correspond throughout, especially in cases where we have the same English metres which are as popular as any which our hymn books contain. Such is the fact with regard to her hymn for the "Third Sunday in Advent," translated from Paul Gerhardt's "*Wie soll ich Dich empfangen*," which is in the metre of "*From Greenland's icy mountains*."

We greatly regret this failure to reproduce the metres of the original, as it almost entirely prevents the translations from being sung to their original glorious melodies. Nor can we understand the principle upon which Miss Winkworth has adopted her metres, as so many of them will require the composition of entirely new tunes, before they can be sung. This is the more to be regretted, as the great mass of these pieces are highly devotional, and would be a great addition to our collection of English hymns. Still, there is quite a number in our established metres, and we doubt not that these will soon take their place among our most popular English hymns. As it is, the book will take its place among the very best collections of our devotional poetry—indeed we are not sure that there is elsewhere in the English language anything at all equal to it. Keble's "Christian Year," which has so long stood almost alone, is certainly inferior to it in many respects, but above all, in its devotional character. We think we might cite their pieces for the "Second Sunday in Advent," severally, as fair specimens of the two collections. Keble commences,

"Not till the freezing blast is still,
Till freely leaps the sparkling rill,
And gales sweep soft from summer skies,
As o'er a sleeping infant's eyes
A mother's kiss—ere calls like these
No sunny gleam awakes the trees,
Nor dare the tender flowrets show
Their bosoms to th' uncertain glow."

The "Lyra Germanica" gives one of Rist's hymns, beginning,—

"Awake, thou careless world, awake!
The final day shall surely come;
What heaven hath fixed time cannot shake,
It cannot sweep away thy doom."

Know, what the Lord himself hath spoken,
 Shall come at last and not delay,
 Though heaven and earth shall pass away,
 His steadfast word cannot be broken."

But we have not room for citations, nor for further comparison, and can only urge our readers who have not yet read the book, to procure it without delay, being assured that they will find it a companion at once pleasant and profitable. We venture to prophesy for it not a short-lived popularity, but a permanent place in the department of literature to which it belongs.

ARTICLE VIII.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

The Inspiration of Holy Scripture, its Nature and Proof: eight Discourses, preached before the University of Dublin.
 By William Lee, M. A. Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, No. 530 Broadway.—1857.

WE do not know of any period in the history of the church, when the publication of a work like the one named above could have been more seasonable, more welcome to those who believe in the divine origin of the Bible, than in our day. The doctrine of the plenary inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures has been, in all ages, assailed in various ways, and from different points of attack, by the enemies of religion. But, for some considerable time past, modern rationalism has, within the very pale of the church, propounded views more or less unsound, and irreconcilable with the sacred word itself, and the faith of the church, and men, writing professedly in the service of christianity, have been, and are advancing and advocating opinions utterly destructive, if they could be sustained, of the credibility and authority of Scripture. To say nothing of the grossly rationalistic views of Bretschneider and that entire school, we need only refer to the more recent productions of Morell and Davidson, of whom the former, in his "Philosophy of Religion," denies, as does the rather influential school to which he belongs, that the Old Testament has any claims to inspiration, or sustains any vital relation to the New, whilst the latter alleges, that the sacred writers not only made mistakes, but contradicted each other, and even themselves.

We thus briefly advert to recently-published heresies concerning this vitally important subject, heresies set forth and advocated with considerable ingenuity, to show how desirable it is, that they should be encountered with such ability and learning as are adequate to set the great doctrine impugned by them, in its proper light, to defend it with sound argument, and to substantiate it by the *ὁμολογίαν* of the church from the beginning, and by the authority of the divine word itself. That this has been most effectually and satisfactorily done in the admirable work now before us, will, we doubt not, be fully admitted by all who have examined it, or may yet examine it. We believe, indeed, that it will be found more satisfactory than any work yet produced in Germany on this subject, simply because it is more comprehensive, and enters more fully and thoroughly into the discussion and defence of our doctrine, than any German treatise that we know of. The author is evidently thoroughly at home in German Theology, and acknowledges his deep indebtedness to Olshausen, Hävernick, Sack, Beck, and especially to Rudelbach's treatise on Inspiration, published in his and Guericke's *Zeitschrift*. He does not seem to be acquainted with the writings of Stier, who has, in sundry places, very valuable and striking observations upon the divine inspiration of the Bible. Among recent German productions belonging to this category, the just named treatise by Rudelbach is the most important and valuable, as it addresses itself with great ability and erudition directly to the great theme discussed by our author; but even this is rather brief, comparatively incomplete, and does not, like Prof. Lee's work, cover the whole ground that ought to be embraced by a full exhibition, a searching examination, and a careful and elaborate defence of a doctrine so vitally important, so often, so insidiously and so malignantly assailed as this, that "*all* scripture is given by inspiration of God."

It was the vagueness which too often characterizes the language employed by writers who, in modern times, have treated of the Inspiration of Holy Scripture, that seemed to our author to render a fundamental examination into the nature of this divine influence daily more desirable. After adverting, in his Preface, to the so-called "Mechanical Theory," he proceeds: "The 'mechanical' theory having been tacitly abandoned—at least by all who are capable of appreciating the results of criticism—and no system altogether satisfactory having been proposed in its stead, there has gradually sprung up a want of definiteness and an absence of consistency in the language used when speaking of Inspiration, owing to which those who are most sincere in maintaining the divine character of the Bible have, not unfrequently, been betrayed into concessions fatal to its supreme authority."—p. 4. In endeavoring to supply a deeply felt desideratum, he endeavors carefully to do what even writers who insist upon the importance of the principle, have failed to do, i. e., to distinguish between Revelation and Inspiration. His treatise on this most im-

portant distinction is very elaborate, clear and satisfactory. Very modestly declining to lay claim to any amount of originality for his own labors, he says: "My object, throughout, has simply been to collect as many facts and results as my acquaintance with ancient or modern researches into the text or interpretation of scripture could" supply, and thence to deduce what appeared to be the necessary inference." In pursuing his admirable discussion, he combats the errors and mischievous theories that grew up on the reeking hot-bed of German rationalism, and also the very pernicious views propounded by Coleridge and Morell. The work appears, as the title-page indicates, in the form of eight discourses preached before the University of Dublin. We subjoin the general headings of the several Lectures, hoping that many of our readers will themselves look up the more particular specifications, and merely adding here, that the first lecture begins with some general remarks on the distinction between Revelation and Inspiration. "The Logos reveals. The Holy Spirit inspires." I. "The Question Stated." II. "The Immemorial Doctrine of the Church of God." III. "The Old Testament and the New. The Logos the Revealer." IV. "Revelation and Inspiration." V. "Revelation and Inspiration. (Subject continued.)" VI. "Scriptural Proof." VII. "The Commission to write—The Form of what was written." VIII. "Recapitulations. Objections considered." The several themes here stated are discussed under a variety of necessary and more specific subdivisions, under a solemn sense of the importance of the subject, with humble reverence for the authority of the written word, with elaborate carefulness, and great clearness and force of thought and language. The question is stated with great clearness and fulness, and cleared of all the misconceptions and ambiguities which have so long and so extensively beclouded men's minds with regard to it: fundamental principles or general truths are presented in comprehensive and terse propositions, which are amply unfolded, conclusively demonstrated, effectually defended and aptly illustrated: objections are met, answered and confuted with lucid and convincing argumentation; and the entire subject is presented, under its different aspects and relations, with a copiousness of matter and a felicity of manner, that leave little to be desired.

But, admirable as the body of the work itself is, it contains other matter which will greatly enhance its value in the estimation of the learned, and of theological students: the notes present an immense mass of literature connected with the subject of the lectures: in these notes a great many, more or less copious, citations are given from the Greek and Latin Fathers: modern writers, German and English, are largely quoted, and their views, where they are unsound and unscriptural, subjected to searching criticisms; and a great variety of matter, all bearing more or less directly and weightily upon the great theme under discussion, is introduced at the proper place; for, while these notes are proba-

bly a good deal more extensive than the text itself, they are not, as is so often done, huddled together in a cumbrous mass at the end of the volume, where it is very inconvenient to refer to them, but in every instance introduced at once in the lower margin of their respective pages.

Doré. By a Stroller in Europe. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers.—1857.

This is a volume of letters written during a year's residence in Europe. The author looks upon European life and institutions as an externally gilded affair; hence the title *Doré*. The tone of the letters is free and easy, lively and brusque: they are written in a bold and dashing style: men and things are handled without gloves, with a frequent application of a very harsh flesh-brush: subjects peculiarly adapted to attract and engage the attention of an American travelling in Europe, are treated in an off-hand, who-cares fashion, which stands upon ceremony with nothing and nobody; and altogether, the work is very different from all books of travels en règle. While we can by no means approve of the manner in which some things are treated, we cannot but say that these letters are exceedingly interesting; they have provoked much notice and gained much praise: there is little danger of any reader's nodding over the pages: they contain some curious information: lively and spicily throughout, they place many things in a new light, extract much amusement from the varnish and gilding and absurdities of European society, and to those whose proprieties have not been run through the potatoes-poultry-prunes and prism starch, they cannot but afford, with some instruction, a great deal of entertainment.

Memorials of Captain Hedley Vicars, Ninety-seventh Regiment. By the Author of "The Victory won." New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, No. 530 Broadway.—1857.

This delightful volume narrates the life of a young British Soldier, who fell, in the prime of his manhood, in the night of the 22d of March, before Sebastopol, while repelling with his troop a night attack of the enemy. Beginning with his boyhood, it follows him to the end of his career, relating the events of his short life in a pleasing style, or permitting him to be, to a considerable extent, his own biographer, by introducing a good many of his charming letters to his mother, his sisters, and to different friends. A bold and fearless boy, generous and warm-hearted but withal rather self-willed, full of frolic and fun, his early years afforded no promise of that vigorous and consistent piety which afterwards so greatly distinguished him among his fellow-officers and soldiers, winning for him the esteem, the confidence and the affection of all. His pious father having died when the boy was twelve years old, his religious instruction and training devolved upon his exemplary mother; and the narrative before us exhibits but another instance of the efficacy, under God's blessing,

of a pious mother's teachings, admonitions and instant prayers, over the spirits, and hearts, and lives of those whom God has committed to her care. At an early age this young man was brought to realize the power of saving truth and grace, and to the sacred profession of the christian; and from this time to the end, his walk and conversation were truly exemplary: his natural gifts exalted by piety, his amiable qualities sanctified by grace, he presented in all the relations of life, a most attractive and engaging character, truly adorning the doctrine of God his Savior in all things; and in his labors, by instruction, exhortation and prayer, for the spiritual good of his fellow-officers and the men under his command, and of all who came within the reach of his influence, he was most devoted and unremitting. His early death called forth the warmest testimonials of his pure and lovely character, from many who knew him intimately, and who furnished the materials for this most interesting biography. We regard this memoir as a most delightful illustration of the beauty and excellence of christian character, and of the charm and power of christian example, and most heartily commend the volume to parents who desire to set before their children, especially their sons, an example of early and consistent piety most worthy of imitation.

Lutheranism in America: an Essay on the present condition of the Lutheran Church in the United States. By W. J. Mann, D. D., Pastor of the German Ev. Luth. St. Michael's and Zion's Congregation, in Philadelphia. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston.—1857.

Dr. Mann has no doubt done his best in this little volume, and, all things considered, his best may be considered quite respectable, but we are free to say, that we cannot accept as satisfactory, his account of the Lutheran Church in the United States, particularly that part which is embraced by the General Synod.

Commentary on the book of Joshua. By Karl Frederick Keil, D. D., Ph. D. Professor of Exegetical Theolog and the Oriental Languages in the University of Dorpat. Translated by James Martin, B. A., Edinburg. Edinburg: T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street.—1857. Smith and English, Philadelphia.

Dr. Keil is not unknown to the readers of the Ev. Rev. His orthodoxy, learning and exegetical skill, have more than once found utterance in our pages. We very much admire whatever we have seen from his pen, and can cordially endorse his Joshua, translated in Scotland, as a work of sterling value. Pious, learned, sound, it deserves a high place, we may say, so far as our knowledge extends, the very highest place among commentaries on the important historical book which it embraces.

Dr. Seyffarth's reply to queries in a former number, intended for our present issue, came too late. It will appear in our next.

INDEX TO VOL. VIII.

- American Lutheranism, Schmucker's 294
 Antiquities, Egyptian 34
 Apel, Prof. F. L., Art. by 284
 Apostleship, Paul's preparation for the 219
 Auberlen's Prophecies 151
 Autobiography of an Actress 564
 Baptismal Regeneration 303
 Baillie's memoir of Newton 290
 Berger, Rev. J., memoir of 210
 Bonner's Adventures of Beckworth 293
 Bunsen's Signs of the Times 444
 Church Government 123
 Church, unity of the 1
 Clarke's Grammar 297
 Commentary on Joshua 598
 Cowdery's Moral Lessons 297
 Doré 597
 Draper's Human Physiology 448
 Dutch Republic, Rise of the 143
 Egyptian Antiquities 34
 English Hymnology 237
 Eyster, Rev. M., memoir of 113
 Fairbairn's Prophecies 150
 Fall of the Angels 177
 Geissenhainer, Rev. Dr. F. W., memoir of 501
 Goertner, Rev. J. P. memoir of 186
 Growth of Individualism 533
 Haas' Catechism 295
 Harper's Magazine 152, 301, 451
 Help's Spanish Conquest 291
 Hengstenberg's Christology of the Old Testament 293
 Hodges' Ephesians 289
 Holy Words 299
 Horae Germanicae 589
 Incomprehensibility of God 153
 Inspiration of Holy Scripture 594
 Israel and the Gentiles 485
 Kahn's German Protestantism 159
 Kame's Elements of Criticism 296
 Keiser, Rev. J. R., Art. by 153
 Knight's Knowledge is Power 309
 Krauth, Rev. C. F., Art. by 354
 Krauth's Former Days and these Days 451
 Kurtz, Rev. Dr. J. D. memoir of 519
 Lintner, Rev. Dr. G. A., Art. by 123
 Litton's Church of Christ 450
 Lochman, Rev. A. H., Art. by 436
 Lord's Day 354
 Lord's Supper Practically Considered 436
 Long's Classical Atlas 451
 Loy, Rev. M., Art. by 1
 Lutheran Almanac for 1857 296
 Lutheran Church and the Divine Obligation of the Lord's Day 354
 Lutheran Symbols 454
 Lutheran Publications 264
 Lutheranism in America 598
 Lyra Germanica 591
 McPherson Edward, Art. by 533
 Memorials of Captain Hedley Vickers 597
 Morris' Catharine De Bora 299
 Morris' Rome & Back again 299
 Motley's Dutch Republic 143
 Notices of New Publications 149, 289, 444
 Oswald's Exposition of Prophecy 449
 Prayers for Individuals and Families 152
 Preparation of Paul for the Apostleship 219
 Publications of Lutherans in the United States 264
 Queries on Egyptian Antiquities 415
 Rauch's Inner Life of the Christian 451
 Reed's Lectures 299

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Reminiscences of Lutheran Cler- | Tendencies of the Stage 564 |
| gymen 105, 186, 395, 501 | Teutonic Languages 284 |
| Seyffarth's Lectures on Egyptian | Todd's Questions on the Patriarchs |
| Antiquities 34 | 301 |
| Schaeffer, Rev. Dr. C. A. Art by 303 | Tocqueville's Regime and the Rev. |
| Schaeffer's Inaugural Address 295 | olution 447 |
| Schaeffer, Rev. Dr. F. C., memoir | Turner's Commentary on Ephesi- |
| of 200 | ans 149 |
| Schmidt, Rev. Dr. H. I. Art by 485 | Ullman's Reformers 151 |
| Seiss' Last Times 294, 450 | Unity of the Church 1 |
| Steck, Rev. M. J., memoir of 105 | Valentine Rev. M., Art. by 219 |
| Stoever's Memoir of Muhlenberg | Warren's Physical Geography 298 |
| 151 | Weiser's German Captive 298 |
| Storch, Rev. C. G. A., memoir of | Welch's Analysis of the English |
| 398 | Language 297 |
| Shober, Rev. G., memoir of 404 | Whateley's Apothegms 152 |
| Sprague's Annals of the American | Winslow on the work of the Holy |
| Pulpit 452 | Spirit 150 |

